

Binderly

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXVI, No. 669

April 21, 1952

POINT FOUR—A REVOLUTION AGAINST HUNGER, DISEASE, AND HUMAN MISERY • <i>Addresses by</i> <i>President Truman and Secretary Acheson</i>	607
PROBLEMS FACING UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS IN ASIA AND AFRICA • <i>by Ambassador Francis B. Sayre</i>	623
GOOD FAITH VS. EMPTY PROMISES IN THE WAR OF IDEAS • <i>by Adrian S. Fisher</i>	618
PROGRESS TOWARD SOLUTION OF EUROPE'S REFUGEE PROBLEM • <i>by George L. Warren</i>	633
SIXTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUMMARY ACTION: Part I • <i>by Paul B. Taylor</i>	632



For index see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXVI, No. 669 • PUBLICATION 4569

April 21, 1952

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has
been approved by the Director of the
Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated.

Point Four—A Revolution Against Hunger, Disease, And Human Misery

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN¹

I cannot tell you how much it means to me to come and meet with you tonight. You have come here from all parts of the country, and from all sorts of organizations—church groups, business groups, labor unions, and farm organizations. You have come to discuss ways and means of going ahead with our plans for Point Four.

Point Four takes its name from the last point of a fourfold program for peace in the world—the program I set forth in my Inaugural Address, 3 years ago last January.

We have been working on that program, and we have been making progress.

We have done well on the first three points.

First, we have supported the United Nations.

Second, we have carried forward our plans for world economic recovery.

Third, we have strengthened free nations against aggression.

But these three points by themselves will not bring us the permanent peace we desire. The fourth point, helping the free peoples of the world to help themselves—to produce more—to raise their living standards—and to achieve decent, satisfying lives—this fourth point is in the long run the most important of all. Without it we cannot reach the goal.

Through the measures we have taken in the last several years—aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Pacific treaties, the defense program, the resistance to aggression in Korea—through measures like these we are preventing conquest and world war. We have bought time—we have bought it at a great cost in lives and money.

Now it is up to us to use that time intelligently and courageously. We must use it to wipe out the root causes of war. We must use the time we are gaining by defense to campaign against hunger and disease and human misery.

¹Delivered by Secretary Acheson for the President before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at Washington on Apr. 8 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

Mass suffering has been used by every dictatorship of our times as a stepping stone to power. It was used by the Japanese war lords. It was used by Hitler. Today it is the weapon of Soviet imperialism. Unless it is wiped out it may be used in the future by some new dictatorship more terrible even than the Soviet.

To have peace, we must strike at the conditions of misery that envelop half the people of the earth. That is the purpose and the meaning of Point Four.

Point Four Seen in Light of History

It will help us to understand Point Four if we step back and look at it in the light of history.

In this century, scientific progress has brought us to the point where mankind, for the first time in human history, can wipe poverty and ignorance and human misery clean off the face of the earth.

Yet this cannot be done unless scientific progress is linked with political freedom. That is the lesson of history. Without political freedom, scientific progress can become a menace, rather than a boon to humanity. In the hands of totalitarians, scientific progress can be used to destroy civilization.

But working together, scientific progress and political freedom can open such a future as mankind has never dreamed of.

We have seen what this means in our own country.

What we did here in the United States was to create the kind of political system in which men could breathe freely and work freely—the kind of government in which the energies of human beings could be released to make the most of the material resources around them.

This is why our country has become the center of industry and science. This is why we have been called upon to lead the fight for freedom. We have given greater opportunity to the individual than has ever been known before. We have given more material well-being to all our people than any earlier society was ever able to achieve.

That is what scientific progress and political

freedom have done for us—and for many other countries founded in the traditions of our Western civilization.

Self-Development Fostered In Asia and Africa

Moreover, the tremendous developments that have taken place in the Western world in modern times are having a profound effect upon the ancient civilizations in Asia and Africa.

The people of these areas have learned that they need not suffer hunger, disease, and poverty. They know that something can be done to put a stop to these things. They also have learned of the ideals of political liberty and self-government.

These peoples have watched us and learned from us. Now they are determined to share as equals in the benefits of modern progress.

They are determined that their resources will no longer be developed in the interest of foreigners on the pattern of the old imperialism. And they don't want them developed for the benefit of Soviet imperialism either. They insist that these resources be developed for their own benefit.

They are determined to establish their own free political and economic institutions—institutions which will make use of the best of our experience and will, at the same time, retain the best of their own cultures, and their own great traditions.

This, I believe, is the mood and the temper that has come to Africa and Asia in my lifetime. It is real. It is good. It holds tremendous promise.

Common Sense as Basis of Point Four

At the same time, it has great dangers. Such a movement can be easily misled. Communists or reactionaries can exploit the hopes and aspirations of these peoples for their own evil ends. Unscrupulous agitators can use these forces of change to bring about disorder and bloodshed. We must do all we can to keep this from happening.

We want to help the people of these areas. We want them to learn the methods of our science and our industry and use these methods to develop their own resources.

Above all, we want to help them find out and apply the secret of our own success, the secret of our American Revolution—the secret that the vitality of our science, our industry, our culture, is embedded in our political life—the secret that only free men, freely governed, can make the magic of science and technology work for the benefit of human beings, not against them.

Now, what does Point Four have to do with this? It has everything to do with it. It is the way we have chosen to give our help and share our experience. It is the right way—and the only way—this can be done.

There is nothing of imperialism in our concept of Point Four. We do not propose to dominate other people, or exploit them, or force them to change their ways of life.

The two ideas that guide Point Four are—first, cooperation, freely sought and freely given, and second, help to those who want to help themselves.

Those are the only methods that can succeed today. We must never forget them or depart from them. In no other way can we work as friends and brothers with the awakening peoples in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

This is what Point Four means in the perspective of history. It is the way to prevent human progress from going off the rails—to prevent a smash-up of civilization—and to help bring mankind to the threshold of a brighter, more wonderful future.

This is not starry-eyed idealism. It is just plain, practical common sense. If we fail to do this job, we will never have world peace. We cannot survive as an island of prosperity in a sea of human misery. But if we do the job, the world will be transformed.

Point Four's Message to the World

Just take one specific example. If we could help the people of the Orient get a well-balanced diet—three square meals a day—instead of the few mouthfuls of rice that most of them eat now, just that one change alone would have more impact on the world than all the armies and battles of history.

It is not easy to do a job like this. To raise the level of diet means more than sending seeds and hoes abroad. It means that the people of these countries must develop farm-credit institutions, and irrigation projects, and roads and railroads, and new industries and new employment for the millions who live in cities. This will take technical assistance and capital development.

It will take work by the United Nations and by the governments of other free nations. It will take work by many of our Government agencies. Point Four is not just the concern of the State Department or the Mutual Security Agency, but of the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and other agencies.

But Point Four was never meant to be just a Government program. It is a program of people — our people — helping other people throughout the world.

Individually, and through our organizations, there is much to do—and no time to be lost. Many private organizations are carrying on Point Four programs overseas and they need all the help and support they can get. We can send them tools and books and medical supplies. Our young people can train themselves as technical experts to go abroad. We can welcome students and visitors to our country; we can learn from them while they learn from us.

In all we do, we must remember our great tradition. The American Revolution has never stopped. In almost every generation we have

overturned old ways of life, and developed new ones—always moving toward more freedom, more opportunity, and a better life for all our people. We have had setbacks on the way—but in the end we have always moved forward.

Now, through Point Four, we can help the people in the underdeveloped regions to move forward along the same path. We can help them to adapt the principles of freedom, which have inspired our development, to their own needs and circumstances.

This is the way for us to live up to our ideals as a Nation, and fulfill our destiny as the greatest and most favored Republic God ever made.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ACHESON¹

[Excerpts]

Very often before the committees of Congress and in other audiences to which I have spoken I have been asked the question, "Do you think it right that in our requests from the Congress we should have so large a proportion of our funds requested for military purposes as against the smaller portion which goes into the constructive work of the world?" And I always say: "I think it's very sad, it is nothing that we want; we would much prefer to have it otherwise."

We are taking the leadership in the world in trying to make it otherwise. We have proposals now which are being discussed in the United Nations which would lead to disarmament, lead to the world being relieved of this dreadful burden. But until that can be accomplished we must, whether we like it or not, spend a large part of our time and effort, just as the early settlers of this country had to do, in protecting ourselves, in building up our defenses so that behind that shield the peaceful work can go on.

And this, in passing, leads me to refer to a matter which is perhaps connected with it, and that is the matter of organization. So often in talking about programs of this sort we get distracted into the matter of organization. I'd like to say only one word about that, and that is that it's a characteristic of the human mind that if it fixes itself very intently upon a purpose, and in order to accomplish any purpose you have to fix yourself intently upon it, but if you do that then that purpose begins to expand until after a time in your mind it encompasses the whole world. I see this happening in all the departments of government all the time.

People can start saying, "Well, this is a matter of foreign policy and since it's a matter of foreign policy the State Department must do it and foreign policy affects everything in the world," so

that people who take that view want to tend to expand the jurisdiction of the State Department. Or if you start from the point of view of the Treasury Department or the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce you can say this leads to that and that leads to the next thing, and so this department should control all. And so you find people who say, "All you have to do is to find two characteristics in a program that means that it should be organized and managed by one organization" and those two characteristics are (1) if it's overseas, and (2) if it's economic.

Now, everything that is not in the United States, Canada, or Mexico, in a sense is overseas. And everything that is not purely military is economic and even most of the military program is economic. So that this conception, in which you must have an overseas organization which will run everything outside of the United States, is, I think, to lose sight of the real purpose of some of these programs. I will not go on with this at length but merely say that the economic work which is being done in Europe itself in connection with the military program is far more closely associated with the military program than it is with the sort of thing that we are doing here in Point Four. So I urge you not to waste your time on these matters of organization at present but to concentrate on the main point.

So we not only have to build our shield here, our military shield, but we have to give great effort and great thought to the economic environment as well as the security environment. And here I'm sorry to say that there is much to discourage the person who is interested in helping to get international developments in the economic field. It isn't enough to have programs which will develop undeveloped areas, if you have a completely stagnant situation in the exchange of goods throughout the world. We all know that in the early stages of development of underdeveloped areas we must concentrate on the agricultural side of affairs. And that means that there must be considerable trade in other goods. And if one has a situation where trade is stagnant because of barriers, because of lack of foreign exchange, because of all the impediments to it which exist, there will be a very great break and great drag upon the development of underdeveloped areas, no matter how enthusiastic we are about Point Four and no matter how much effort we put into it.

I have been working for 12 years on the effort to free international trade from some of its barriers and I regret to say that there are as many now as there were when we began and the outlook is discouraging. But we must continue to fight for it and you must continue to help us because this matter of freeing trade throughout the world and bringing about a greater exchange of goods is essential for the purpose that you are meeting here today to consider.

¹ Made before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development at Washington on Apr. 9 and released to the press on the same date.

Cooperation From Private Investors and Organizations Urged

Similarly, in the economic field, there is the matter of investment. Unless there is a climate to encourage investment abroad you will not get the developments in underdeveloped areas which we are seeking. And unhappily the climate does not seem to be getting better but in many parts of the world to be getting worse. There seems to be an idea that there is something bad about foreign investment in some parts of the world. Companies, people who have put a great deal of money, a great deal of effort into developments in underdeveloped areas are treated as though they were enemies of the country in which they are working. If that goes on it just means that there will not be foreign investment and there will not be, as you all know, governmental capital sufficient to do this job. And, after all, it doesn't make much difference whether the investment is the property of all the citizens of the country or some of the citizens. If the whole climate for the reception of foreign investment in a country is bad, then the capital will not go there, whether it's private or governmental.

And, again, there must be an environment which is congenial to the exchange of persons and ideas. If, in parts of the world, foreigners are regarded as suspicious and as enemies, then again you have a lack of the necessary environment to carry on the purposes which we want here. In other words, this must be a two-way street, there must be friendliness on the side of those whom we are trying to help as well as the desire on our part to be of help. And all through everything that we do we must keep in mind that what we are after here is to preserve and safeguard the underlying human values.

It's very helpful to me to have this opportunity to come and talk with you. A conference of this sort, this conference is of tremendous importance to the carrying out of this program because this program is fundamentally not something which a government as a government carries out. Now, I don't mean by that merely that private organizations are very important in actually carrying out programs abroad. That is true, but even more than that the entire effort that the government agency carries out here is really carried out through private organizations.

We do not have in the Government sufficient people to staff these operations, sufficient people to give us all the ideas, to give us all the working groups which are necessary. We turn to you. We turn to the colleges, to the groups, and to the organizations in the United States. And it is only if we are successful altogether in doing this work, as one great undertaking in which we are all concerned, that it will be successful. It takes the unending labor of organizations such as yours to make young men and women want to go into this

sort of work and want to go into it with a sense of dedication, with a sense of believing, as the early missionaries to this country believed, that there is something worth any degree of sacrifice in the task.

I know, in speaking with you, that I do not have to convince you that the Point Four Program is a good program. I don't have to stress its importance. What you would like me to do is to talk in the first place, about the subject of the morning, the Program in Action. And in doing that, again I shall do it not with the purpose of trying to build up your enthusiasm—because that is built up and you understand this program—but from the point of view of pointing out some of the underlying factors which we have to have in mind when we operate here.

Understanding Necessary to Allay Suspicions

And, again, if I may go back to a hackneyed subject, in order to understand the limitations which are necessary in the Program in Action and the methods which are necessary, we have to remind ourselves once more what it is that we are trying to do and what is the background out of which our present efforts emerge. Now, that background, as the President pointed out last night, is that two ideas of greatest importance are striking millions of people in the underdeveloped parts of the world at the same time, striking them with great suddenness and with great power. And these two ideas are, first of all, that a life of misery is not foreordained, that something can be done about it, that much can be done about it. And the second idea is that independence, freedom from foreign domination and foreign direction, is within their grasp and nothing is going to be allowed to interfere with that.

Now, these two ideas are ideas which have moved peoples profoundly over the centuries and they are hitting people, millions of people, in the underdeveloped areas for the first time with great power since the war.

And that leads to tremendous ferment. It leads to tremendous comings and goings in the population and the thoughts of the population. The purpose of the Point Four Program is to help direct this energy, this ferment, into peaceful channels of development, rather than into mere chaos. We know perfectly well that there is a tendency to look for panaceas. Indeed in many parts of the world these two thoughts which I have been describing to you are often confused. Many people in many parts of the world are led to believe that the mere attainment of national independence will bring automatically the fuller life, the freedom from poverty and misery and disease. We know of course that that is not the case. Therefore, these people, once being disappointed—because being free they are not merely immediately in good shape—turn to another panacea, which is

that of communism, which promises them that if they will embrace this doctrine then all these things will happen.

But what the Point Four Program is intended to do is to say we have knowledge, we have skills which you have seen and which are in part the cause of this great ferment which is going on in your minds. We are ready to share them with you. And we wish to work out with you methods by which you can know what we know and we can help you develop your own resources for your own purposes.

Limitations In the Program

Now, this being so, if we look at the nature of the people and the nature of the situation with which we are dealing we begin to see some necessary limitations in the Program in Action. One necessary limitation comes from the fact that many, if not most, of the peoples with whom we are dealing are suspicious of foreigners. Foreigners have come to them very often in the past and not always, or perhaps not often, with the best results. Therefore, they are suspicious. Why are these people coming to us? Why are they offering to do this for us? Is there some hidden purpose? Is there some desire on their part to get control of our country? These are the questions they ask themselves.

Then there is the limitation of the absorptive capacity of the peoples we are trying to help. Absorptive in several ways. First of all, they must take it in through their mind and through the training of their hands. And this cannot be done overnight. This is a long process.

Then there is the confusion in their minds as to what they want. Some want one thing and some another. Very often they haven't the real knowledge to understand what it is that they really need at the moment. There is a great desire in every part of the world for industrialization and there is very little understanding of how dangerous that is until there is in sight a strong agricultural base.

I think in all the times that I have talked with visitors from foreign countries since the war and, indeed, during the war, everyone who has come into my office starts out with, "We would like a steel mill." Well, they want a steel mill in every single country in the world. It makes no difference whether they have ore or coal or anything else. The steel mill is the mark of civilization, and that is what they want.

Now, it's not a question of pouring vast sums of money and vast numbers of technicians into these areas. It couldn't be done if we wanted to do it. Sometimes I have been in meetings where people talk about billions of dollars or hundreds of thousands of technicians being poured all over the world. Those people never stop to think of where the technicians are going to sleep and what

they are going to do. The mere question of housing of the missions which are already being sent out is a serious one in parts of the world where there aren't many houses. This thing has got to be done sensibly.

Adjusting to Internal Situations in Foreign Countries

Now, without going on further into a theoretical discussion, let me speak of one or two actual situations to show what can be done and what should not be done.

The first real necessity for success is that what you offer to do or what you're doing is something which the country wants. Now, often it's very hard to bring that about because the country doesn't know what it wants. But if the country does know what it wants and if what it wants is the right thing for it, then what you should do is to get in behind that and help with all your power and not say, "Oh, well, I wouldn't do it just this way, I would do it that way." If they have a good idea and one that is an effective one, get behind it and help them.

That is the situation in India. There the program is one which the Indians have worked out themselves. True they have worked it out with the help of American technicians, but they sought the technicians. We didn't force the technicians on them. They came out themselves with their own money. They employed these technicians. And they went to India and they developed an Indian governmental program which was started. So that when we came into the picture we could throw our help into something which had been developed by India with our people merely training the Indians who are training their comrades how to carry on this program. Immediately the thing caught hold like a prairie fire and the Government has now organized with us the Indo-American Fund, a joint undertaking, something which they started, something which they believe in. And we put all our effort and funds into that.

Starting with a small group where boys from these villages were taught the fundamentals of what they should do to increase food production and have better public health. Starting with that training school, boys, young men go back to their villages and persuade the elders of the village to adopt this rather revolutionary idea. This spreads on from there to other villages which have heard about this. They in turn come in to look at it and find everybody with two or three times as much food as they had before. The newcomers say, "We want that." Thus you finally get a program where the propulsive force comes from the country itself, and we are going along to help it.

Now, you find other situations where the country not only doesn't know what it wants but

isn't equipped to play any part in getting it. And there a great mistake would be made if we went in and said, "This is what you want, here are a lot of Americans, we will do this. We will undertake to train your people." What you have got to do is to start at the very beginning.

There was a situation such as that in one country which we are helping. There, as in almost all these places, the great need was for an increase in the food supply. When we got to the country we found that the only people dealing with agriculture was the thing called a "bureau," which was made up of six people with a budget of \$6,000 a year. Six people in the entire country dealing with agriculture! Well, you couldn't get anywhere until the country itself was better organized to be a partner in this effort. And, therefore, the first job was to show them how to develop the proper bureaus to carry on agricultural extension work in their country. That was done. Then programs were developed in conjunction with this new governmental outfit.

The other day I had a visit from some people in a very small country and they had come up to say, "Go easy. Take it easy. We are being overwhelmed by good will." They had at the same time six international organizations—the United States organization and four private ones—descend on them. And they said there were almost more "good-willers" in the country than there were citizens in the country. The country was simply bewildered. It didn't know what to do. People were starting projects and deciding they weren't any good and, the happy phrase, "cutting their losses," didn't carry much conviction to the population.

So finally we said, "Now, let's all get together here and let's all sit down and work out some coordinated plan, get the people and the government of the country in agreement with this and then go ahead a little more slowly."

You must adjust what you're doing to the absorptive capacity of the country and the willingness of the country to have you carry on the program. Money isn't the right way to go at it. Money is essential, money is necessary. Sometimes a lot of money is necessary, as in the Indian program where in order to carry out and reach the goals within the time which is allotted we must move much faster than the pure theory of technical assistance would permit.

Exportation of the American Idea

Those are some of the ideas which can be developed much more fully with others in your panel discussions this morning. But what I should like to leave with you are the points which I have just made.

First of all, that Point Four is one among many points. It is not the whole foreign policy. It cannot succeed unless the whole foreign policy succeeds.

Second, it must be adjusted. The work that we do must be adjusted to the condition, the situation in the country. It must be infinitely flexible.

Third, and it follows from the second, do not be doctrinaire about Point Four. Do not be like the Socialist Party where you have the pure doctrine and then 50 splinter doctrines coming off it. Do not say, "This is with Point Four and this is without Point Four." That sort of rigid thinking, I believe, gets us nowhere. Point Four must mean that we are primarily engaged in helping to teach these people how to help themselves.

Now, what is necessary to bring that about in a particular country depends on that country. And, therefore, do not be rigid. Do not have purely doctrinaire ideas.

And, finally, one last thought. We have said over and over again that this is exporting the American idea, the American Revolution, or the American dream. It is very true, but if that is true let us be sure, and be terribly sure, that we are preserving the American dream, the American idea, in America.

Do not let us be smug and believe that merely because you can read in the books that America was like this, or that Abraham Lincoln said it was like this, it will be like that without our constant effort and our constant fighting to make our country what we want it to be and what we believe it has been and will be in the future.

Current Legislation on Foreign Policy

Joint Economic Report. Report of the Joint Committee on the January 1952 Economic Report of the President with Supplemental and Minority Views and Materials Prepared by the Staff on National Defense and the Economic Outlook for the Fiscal Year 1953. S. Rept. 1295, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 134 p.

Revision of Immigration and Nationality Laws. Minority Views. S. Rept. 1137, Part 2. 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. 2550] 11 pp.

Amending Section 3 (A) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended. S. Rept. 1319, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. 2611] 3 pp.

Amending Section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. S. Rept. 1235, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. 2544] 4 pp.

Extension of Rubber Act of 1948. H. Rept. 1513, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany H. R. 6787] 7 pp.

Investigating the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act Since December 18, 1941. S. Rept. 1294, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. Res. 245] 2 pp.

Assist in Preventing Aliens From Entering or Remaining in the United States Illegally. H. Rept. 1505, 82d Cong., 2d sess. [To accompany S. 1851] 3 pp.

Supplementary Extradition Convention With Canada. Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on Executive G. S. Exec. Rept. 5, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 18 pp.

Continuance of the Mutual Security Program. Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Recommendations for the Continuance of the Mutual Security Program for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1953. H. Doc. 382, 82d Cong., 2d sess. 14 pp.

U. S.-Netherlands Relations Reviewed

Address by the President¹

The carillon which Your Majesty has presented on behalf of the people of the Netherlands will be a wonderful gift. When it is completed it will greatly enrich the life of this city, and it will bring pleasure to millions of Americans when they come to visit this National Capital. No gift could be a better symbol of the harmonious relations which have always existed, and which should always continue to exist, between the Netherlands and the United States. On behalf of the people of the United States I am happy to accept this gift from the people of the Netherlands.

Our two countries have always been close together in spirit. There are many communities in this country, including our largest city, that owe their origin to the early Dutch settlers who came over here. Three of our Presidents—Martin Van Buren, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—traced their origins to the Netherlands.

The people of the Netherlands are no strangers to us. They are welcome here whether they come as visitors or as settlers.

Last September Queen Juliana wrote a remarkable letter to me.² In that letter she expressed her great concern over the plight of the refugees in Europe and expressed the hope that something could be done to alleviate their distress and to give them new lives of usefulness and dignity. It was a letter full of compassion and human understanding for the problems of these unfortunate people.

Since that time, I have been working to find a way to help solve this problem. Our Government is supporting an international effort to provide opportunities for resettlement overseas not only for the unfortunate refugees of Europe but also for those people who live in overcrowded areas and need a chance to migrate.

¹ Made on the occasion of the acceptance of a gift of a carillon from Queen Juliana at Meridian Hill Park, Washington, on Apr. 4 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

² BULLETIN of Oct. 8, 1951, p. 572.

I have recently sent a message to the Congress recommending that this country provide aid to those escaping from Communist tyranny and at the same time accept additional immigration into this country.³ One of the recommendations I made was that we should admit additional families from the Netherlands. I hope the Congress will act favorably on this recommendation. If they do, we can add to the already warm ties which bind the United States and the Netherlands together.

The people and the Government of the Netherlands are working closely with us in our struggle to bring about permanent peace in the world. They know how terrible war can be. They know it first-hand from the Nazi invasion. When the Netherlands was overrun, the spirit of the people, however, did not die. It found expression in the courageous resistance movement of the Dutch people. Queen Wilhelmina visited us in those sad and terrible years. She demonstrated for all of us the undying courage of the Dutch people and their faith in ultimate victory. In those days, we worked together for victory—now we work together for peace.

The American people are proud and happy to have been able to contribute to the revival of the Netherlands after the war. We have been impressed by the vigorous way in which the Dutch people have rebuilt their economy. We have great admiration for the plans now being carried forward in the Netherlands to reclaim additional land from the sea.

Most of all, we have been impressed by the determination with which the people of the Netherlands have joined in the common defense of Europe. The Netherlands is an important member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And now Dutch Armed Forces are preparing to enter into the European Defense Community. It is only through this kind of effort, it is only

³ Ibid., Apr. 7, 1952, p. 551.

through unity with other nations, that any one of the free nations can make itself secure against the threat of war in the future. Through the United Nations, through the North Atlantic Treaty, the people of the Netherlands and the United States are working side-by-side for peace in the world.

Your Majesty, Your Royal Highness, we are happy to have you with us. We are grateful for the magnificent gift which the people of Holland are making to us. We hope you will come again.

When you return to your country I hope you will carry the thanks of the American people to the people of the Netherlands and that you will express to them our good wishes and cordial friendship.

General Eisenhower Asks Release From SHAPE Assignment

[Released to the press by the White House April 11]

The Secretary of Defense has addressed the following letter to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander, Allied Powers Europe:

APRIL 10, 1952

DEAR GENERAL EISENHOWER: In accordance with your request contained in your letter of 2 April, and with the approval of the President, I am taking appropriate action to secure your release from assignment as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers Europe, effective 1 June, and to have you placed on inactive status upon your return to the United States.

With kindest regards, I am
Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT

The following is the text of General Eisenhower's letter to the Secretary of Defense:

2 APRIL 1952

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I request that you initiate appropriate action to secure my release from assignment as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers Europe, by approximately June 1st, and that I be placed on inactive status upon my return to the United States. A relief date fixed this far in advance should provide ample time for the appointment of a successor and for any preparation and counsel that he may desire from me.

This proposal is in the spirit of the understanding I gain from officials in Washington who outlined the special purposes of my original appointment in December 1950. At that time it was believed by those individuals that, because of past experience, I had relationships with respect to Europe which would facilitate the formation

of a common defense structure and the establishment of a pattern for its operation. An assumption on the part of responsible officials of our Government that I could be helpful in the vital task of preserving peace was, of course, a compelling reason for instantaneous return to active service and acceptance of this assignment.

As of now, I consider that the specific purposes for which I was recalled to duty have been largely accomplished; the command has been formed, its procedures established, and basic questions settled. Moreover, a program of growth and development, based on early experience and searching reexamination, has been agreed at governmental levels. There are many difficulties to be overcome but, given the wholehearted support of the NATO community, this program will provide a reassuring degree of security in this region, despite the continued presence of the threat of Soviet communism. There is every reason to believe that the NATO nations will continue to work together successfully, toward the goal of a secure peace.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

The following is the text of a letter to Lt. Gen. Paul Ely, Chairman, The Standing Group, North Atlantic Treaty Organization:

2 APRIL 1952

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have this date requested the United States Government to initiate action looking to my relief as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers Europe, by approximately the first of June.

This action is in consonance with my understanding and intentions when the President of the United States, in response to request from the NATO Council, appointed me to the post more than a year ago. It was assumed at that time that wartime experience particularly qualified me to facilitate the initial organization of SHAPE, establishment of its procedures, and the institution of basic programs. Since these phases are now accomplished and in view of the press of other developments, it is my hope to return to inactive military status.

In addition to establishing organizational and procedural patterns, I feel that we have made considerable progress during the past year in our efforts to build adequate defenses in the European region. As related to you in my Annual Report,¹ these gains were accompanied by a number of shortcomings and continuing problems. But, in the main, the results have been definitely positive.

The way to greater progress over the coming months was charted in the memorable conference at Lisbon, the prime significance of which was the

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 14, p. 572.

coordination of military requirements with economic capabilities and the setting of specific goals for each of the NATO countries. If these goals are achieved, we shall see, by the end of this year, respectable forces established on the Continent, with the promise of further increase in future years, including substantial German reinforcement through the European Defense Force. I know that you and your associates will spare no efforts to bring into realization all the essential steps agreed at Lisbon.

When I entered upon my duties in December 1950, I was sure that our common task in Europe was a job that had to be done. From later experience, I am convinced that it can be done and that, given full cooperation, it will be done.

Throughout the period of my service here, the support of the NATO governments, peoples and armed services, and of the Standing Group and Military Committee has been a prime factor in whatever success we have achieved in this command. I am most deeply grateful to you and hope that our NATO commands under your direction will continue to flourish as guardians of the peace.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

William H. Draper, Jr. Named U. S. Representative to NAC

[Released to the press April 8]

The President on April 8 designated Ambassador William H. Draper, Jr., to be U.S. permanent representative to the North Atlantic Council (NAC).

At the same time Ambassador Draper was nominated to be U.S. special representative in Europe, it was announced that upon the reorganization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), he also would become senior U.S. civilian representative in Europe responsible for North Atlantic treaty affairs. A reorganization of NATO was approved by the North Atlantic Council at Lisbon. The reorganization called for the elimination of the Council of Deputies and the estab-

lishment of the North Atlantic Council in permanent session.

Appropriate ministers of the respective governments will attend several meetings each year as in the past. In between these meetings the Council will be in regular session attended by permanent representatives of each country who will represent their governments as a whole.

Ambassador Draper, as the U.S. permanent representative, will represent the U.S. Government as a whole on the North Atlantic Council. Ambassador Frederick L. Anderson, the deputy U.S. special representative in Europe, will serve as Ambassador Draper's general deputy. To assist Ambassador Draper with respect to his activities on North Atlantic treaty matters, Ambassador Livingston T. Merchant is being designated by the President as alternate U.S. permanent representative to NAC and will be Ambassador Draper's chief adviser on NATO matters.

With the designation of Ambassador Draper as U.S. permanent representative, the posts of U.S. special representative in Europe and U.S. permanent representative have been combined in one individual. Thus for the first time, there is a single U.S. official in Europe coordinating and supervising U.S. participation in the North Atlantic Council and the execution of the Mutual Security Program.

Ambassador Draper will be charged with seeing that U.S. activities in these fields are effectively integrated and administered to assure that the defensive strength of the nations concerned shall be built as quickly as possible on a basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. In this capacity Ambassador Draper will represent the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Director for Mutual Security, and the Mutual Security Agency.

Ambassador Merchant, in addition to serving as alternate U.S. permanent representative, will be Ambassador Draper's deputy for political affairs. Ambassador Draper will also be assisted by Paul R. Porter, who will serve as deputy for economic affairs, and Daniel K. Edwards, who will serve as deputy for defense affairs in connection with NAC matters. Messrs. Porter and Edwards will have the personal rank of Minister.

Belgium's and Switzerland's Progress Toward Security

The following statements by Ambassador Murphy and Minister Patterson were made over the NBC-TV network program, "Battle Report," on April 6 and were released to the press on the same date.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT D. MURPHY U.S. AMBASSADOR TO BELGIUM

During the past 30 years, I have represented the United States—in one capacity or another—in some eight different countries. My official travels have taken me through possibly a score of others.

It is safe to say that Belgium is second to none when it comes to making an American feel that he is really not too far from home. The people of Belgium are as much like Americans as any people I know, and as friendly and hospitable. Their vigor, their efficiency, their love of liberty, and their competitive spirit—all are virtues we Americans generally associate with ourselves.

The same is true of another Belgian characteristic: The impatient desire to get on with a given job and to do that job effectively.

This is the Belgian's attitude toward meeting their international commitments. Their record in contributing to their own security, as well as to that of the free world, is excellent. Their cooperation within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is genuine. Their response to the military and economic aid we are giving them is that of a willing industrious partner in a great common effort.

That effort—as we well know—can mean the difference between the preservation of freedom and totalitarian enslavement. The free nations either build the strength and unity with which to deter aggression or face the terrible consequence of failure.

The Belgians have clearly demonstrated their awareness of this hard fact.

Like much of the rest of Western Europe, Belgium emerged from World War II the victim of physical destruction and economic pillage. Its people were gripped by that sense of weakness, and insecurity, and uncertainty which must be expected of those who have experienced foreign occupation and devastation. The Belgians have suffered these not once, but many times. There is little we Americans can teach our Belgian friends about the meaning of war and aggression, for they have seen far too much of both.

Belgium has less than 9 million people, about as many people as New York City. In size, the country is just a little larger than our own State of Maryland. But in 7 short years, the Belgians have staged a spectacular come-back. American aid—although it has been less for Belgium than for other western European countries—has, of course, helped to make that come-back possible. But the Belgians' ability to help themselves is primarily responsible. Through determination, sound policies, and hard work, Belgium has reached an enviable state of solvency, not only economically, but politically, and militarily.

This solvency is greatly to the free world's advantage. Belgium's currency, for example, is among the strongest in the world, and the Belgian franc is backed by a sound money policy.

Up to the end of January 1952, Belgium has extended about 370 million dollars in credits through the European payments system to her neighbors and allies in Europe. In ratio to population that would be the equivalent of at least 15 billion dollars for the United States.

Belgian industrial production is today some 40 percent above prewar levels. Last year, new record highs were set in the production of steel, iron, and electric power.

Belgium's immense overseas territory, the Belgian Congo, which is really the heart of Africa, is an important source of many raw materials of great value to the defense effort of the whole Western World, and especially to the United States.

But what about Belgium's contribution to the defensive military strength of the free world?

Belgium is the only western European nation to demand 24 months of military service of her young men. She added 12 months to the service period almost immediately after the Communists launched their aggression in Korea.

Belgian infantrymen are fighting with the U. N. Forces in Korea. Belgian planes are serving on the Korean airlift.

Belgium has already furnished three divisions to the united army which is being molded for the defense of Europe. By 1954, the Belgians expect to have the full six divisions they have promised General Eisenhower ready for duty. They are also well on their way to having an air force they can be proud of.

Belgium has long been self-sufficient in the production of small arms and small-arms ammuni-

tion. She is rapidly moving toward self-sufficiency in the production of a number of other military end-items. Equally important, she is beginning to produce munitions for other countries of the North Atlantic area.

I am often asked about Belgium's political stability. Belgium gives every evidence of being in full control of her internal political situation.

She has had her share of internal political differences. But then, what democracy does not? The important thing to bear in mind is that communism is only a minor nuisance in Belgium. At the close of the war, the Communists had about 10 percent of the popular vote behind them. Today, that percentage is down to 4 and is still declining.

I don't want to leave the impression that Belgium has reached her peak effort in Western defense. But from a condition of chaos and destruction which marked the end of the war, Belgium has come a long way in the right direction. Crises may lie ahead for Belgium, but there may also be crises ahead for others including ourselves. Every day our power and strength to meet crises are growing.

The problems ahead for the free peoples continue grave. We are still in the process of building the strength with which to insure the freedoms we cherish. But we can, I think, look ahead today with confidence that we have the ability to meet crises and to overcome them.

Our partner, Belgium, is giving an excellent example of speeding progress toward the security we both want.

STATEMENT BY RICHARD C. PATTERSON U.S. MINISTER TO SWITZERLAND

Switzerland is one country about which the average American knows relatively little. Today, I'd like to talk about some of the things which demonstrate that Switzerland is well worth close acquaintance.

When one mentions Switzerland to the man in the street he is most apt to think of a small country. It is true that Switzerland is small. It is not as large as West Virginia. Its population is only a little more than 4.5 million. But its size belies its significance. For Switzerland, indeed, is of great importance to the United States and to the entire free world.

The United States and Switzerland have very much in common.

Like the United States, Switzerland is a union of states, their states being called cantons. The Swiss economy, like ours, is diversified, with free enterprise playing the key role. The Swiss Government also is elected by the people. A Swiss citizen enjoys the same civil liberties as does an American. I believe that Americans who have

seen Switzerland at first hand are impressed with the contributions which democratic Switzerland makes to the free world.

Why is Switzerland, with which we have so much in common so important to us as well as to other free nations?

Here are just a few of the reasons.

Switzerland's economy is perhaps the most stable in Europe. This has meant much to a Western Europe seeking to deter aggression as well as to get back on its feet economically after a very destructive war. The Swiss have contributed more than one-half billion dollars in aid and loans to the relief and rehabilitation of post-war Europe. They have participated in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, which was formed to help carry out the objectives of the Marshall Plan. They also belong to the European Payments Union and have done a great deal to promote the free flow of trade that is essential to healthy European trade relations.

But the Swiss—and this is noteworthy—have not found it necessary to ask for a single American dollar in aid.

Just as the economic strength of Switzerland is valuable to Europe so it is of real moment to the United States. We are joined with a free community of nations, including Switzerland's western European neighbors, in the common defense of democracy. Switzerland's contributions to the economic stability of Western Europe are contributions to the over-all strength of democracy throughout the world.

While it is true that they have established an enviable record in avoiding military conflict, not having fought a war for more than 130 years, their military significance is striking. Above and beyond the obvious importance of Switzerland's geographic and strategic position, it has one of the largest, best-trained, and best-equipped armies in Western Europe. According to an official publication, 800,000 soldiers can be mobilized in a matter of days. This is impressive evidence of an historic democracy's determination to remain free.

As in the United States, Communists exercise no influence over national policies and have virtually no popular following. The Swiss people also recognize the dangers of communism and maintain constant vigilance to prevent its growth.

Although traditionally Switzerland has not sought security through collective action, its policy of armed preparedness is in purpose similar to the policy currently being pursued by the United States and other countries of the free world. The purpose of all of us is security from aggression.

There can be no doubt about Switzerland's will to defend itself against any aggressor. The ability and determination of the Swiss to resist attack are significant contributions to world security.

Good Faith vs. Empty Promises in the War of Ideas

by Adrian S. Fisher
Legal Adviser¹

In the early days of the Republic, the Congress approved the appointment of three consular officials who were considered adequate to handle such problems as might confront the new nation in the field of foreign affairs. I think we can safely predict that that day is gone—never to return.

Through the years, and somewhat reluctantly, we have come to realize that our destiny is closely linked to that of other nations. As this realization has penetrated deeper into the consciousness of succeeding generations of Americans, international affairs have occupied a place of increasing importance in the life of the Nation. In keeping with this development, the agency of the Government responsible for foreign affairs has grown until today the Secretary of State has an overseas staff of nearly 20,000 people, including persons employed locally, in 290 missions scattered through nearly 75 countries. In addition, there are nearly 10,000 on the headquarters staff.

Much of the growth shown here postdates World War II and as such reflects the world leadership thrust upon us after V-J Day. Be that as it may, 30,000 people is a lot of people. They do the staff work on American foreign policy. And when you consider the scope and the variety of the international problems facing us and the enormous responsibilities we have assumed, they have plenty to do. But they are not "policy-makers" as such.

In general terms, our foreign policy is an amalgam of what the various interested agencies of the Government believe is required by American interests and the security of the people. It develops out of a distillate of the knowledge and the judgment of hundreds of specialists and technicians. It takes shape as a result of recommendations for action from various officials with a subsequent compromise of conflicting views or

perhaps a rejection of one proposal in favor of another. If a specific plan of action results, it may again make the rounds for scrutiny and criticism. If a major decision is involved the final product then goes to the President for approval.

It is entirely possible that the approved policy may contain ideas or suggestions which originated in the brain of a first secretary in a legation thousands of miles from Washington or which first appeared in a report from a staff economist of the National Security Resources Board. On numerous occasions, policies have been put into effect that were first advanced by private individuals.

There are numerous agencies which participate in making policy. The Constitution charges the President with responsibility for our foreign policy. It placed the purse strings in the hands of the Congress and treaty ratification in the hands of the Senate. The Secretary of State is the top specialist on world affairs in the Administration, but his function is to advise the President and act in his behalf. The Department of Defense, the National Security Resources Board, the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, the Tariff Commission, the National Security Council, and the Psychological Strategy Board also have a finger in the pie.

The overseas organization of the Department has a vital part to play in policy matters. It operates as the eyes and ears of the Nation. The officers of the Foreign Service channel back to headquarters a steady flow of reports on political situations, economic conditions, trade and labor matters, and a variety of other items that bear on American interests. This information is the factual foundation upon which policy is built. It is coordinated and evaluated by the headquarters staff and is moved up through the echelons of the Departmental organization.

In a sense, the senior officers of the Department make up the professional core of policy making. They are at the center of the web, the strands of

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the Massachusetts League of Women Voters' School of International Relations at Cambridge, Mass., on Apr. 1 and released to the press on the same date.

which reach into many agencies of your Government.

There is another group which plays a vital role in the formulation and development of our foreign policy. That is the public of the United States. This does not mean that decisions are made by guessing as to what the Gallup Polls would show and then following the polls regardless of whether it was in the best interest of the United States. What it does mean is that experience has shown that in the long run no policy can be successful unless it has the support of an enlightened and informed public.

The decisions which are made in the field of world affairs affect every one of you. Therefore, you have the privilege and the duty to take an active part. For this reason, a great Secretary of State described the fundamental task in the conduct of foreign affairs as focusing the will of a hundred and forty million people on problems beyond our shores.

The necessary synthesis here has to be developed out of a relationship between the Government and the citizens, wherein the people are fully informed on the why's and wherefore's of a particular situation.

Peace With Justice and Honor

Now, given this frame of policy making—what are the policies that have resulted and on what are they based? The thesis on which we have operated is one, I believe, that is widely accepted and earnestly supported by the American people. We proceed on the conviction that the welfare and the security of the United States are served best by peace—peace with justice and with honor. Further, we are of the opinion that such peace is best obtained through collective security.

Implicit in this thesis is the obligation to do what we can to aid our partners in the collective effort to preserve and extend their freedoms because, like peace, freedom is an entity. Our own freedom is threatened if the freedom of others is erased by tyranny.

Some of the critics of American foreign policy here in this country indignantly condemn this thesis as idealistic and charge that moralizing will get us nowhere. I will grant that there is here a coloration of idealism, but there is also a strong streak of practicality present. I am further convinced that the national interest is best advanced by a blend of idealistic as well as practical considerations.

For some months past and certainly for many months in the future, a major American objective has been opposition to communism and preventing the virus from infecting areas which are now free of contamination. The means to this objective involves the economic, political, and military reconstruction in regions endangered by Soviet

pressure. Included are the situations of strength now under construction in Western Europe, at key points in the Mediterranean, in the Middle East, and in the Far East.

In this effort, we start with three major premises which are equal in importance and entirely interdependent.

We recognize that to a tragic degree the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is rooted in the concept of brute force. Therefore, if a nation or group of nations is to stand up to Moscow or deal with the Kremlin on anything approaching parity, that nation or group of nations has to be able to muster the kind and quantity of military strength that Stalin respects.

We know that the appeal of communism takes its quickest and strongest hold where misery and want abound. Therefore, the antidote to the spread of the Communist virus is the easement of hardship and a standard of living high enough that a man's work yields to him the food, shelter, and clothing necessary to life.

Finally, we have seen that Communist strategy relies on despoiling the victim of his faith in the future of the free world and surrounding him with an atmosphere of social chaos and confusion. Therefore, it is essential that we counter by building the individual's confidence in his capacity to manage his own affairs under conditions of order and stability.

It is evident that the latter two of these premises are far broader of base than the first and that they are linked with two revolutionary movements now sweeping certain areas of the world. Of both these the United States was a progenitor. We were certainly important agents of the revolution of production and perhaps have an even greater hand in the export of the revolutionary concept of the dignity of the individual.

We now witness the reaction of peoples who for the first time have seen economic progress previously undreamt of. We now see the reaction of peoples to ideas of self-government and social justice that they had not heretofore known. We are identified as the champions of those ideas and it is to us that these people look for help in bringing them to pass. We cannot welcome them by offering tanks and planes alone. If there is to be a partnership, it must be a full partnership. It must include food for the mind and the spirit as well as for the stomach.

There is idealism here—but there also is a strong streak of practicality and would be even if there were no Soviet menace. These people are our neighbors in a fast shrinking world. The first premise—a free world rearment—is a direct response to Soviet tactics. It was effected when the Soviet Union rejected a workable standard of disarmament we offered them. We continue to offer it, but as long as the Kremlin fails

to respond, the free world must look to its defenses.

What has been done by the United States to put these premises into force? What has been done to build a strong, well-coordinated group of free nations, able and willing to defend themselves against any potential aggressor?

A number of milestones have already been passed. Through vigorous action in the United Nations, the United States forced the Soviet to withdraw from northern Iran. Prompt assistance by the United States enabled the Greek Government to crush a Communist-instigated revolt. American aid enabled the Turkish Government to maintain its independence in the face of Soviet sabre rattling. The United States put into effect the Marshall Plan, which has given essential assistance in the reconstruction of the economic life of an entire continent. The Marshall Plan has worked. Someone in 1947 commented that the Communists could take over France by picking up the phone. Much the same was true of Italy. The Communists held Government posts, dominated trade-unions, and commanded the support of important blocks of voters. And their strength was rising.

Decline of Communism in Europe

Today, no Communist holds a cabinet post in the governments of our European allies there. Communist strength in the parliaments has dropped. In France, a Communist stronghold, in 1946, out of 627 deputies (in the Parliament) 181 were Communists. Today the number is 95.

The drop in Communist strength is shown in other developments. Party membership in Western Europe is a third lower than in 1946, less than 1½ percent of the population. The circulation of Communist newspapers is half what it was, and many trade-unions have freed themselves of Kremlin control.

At the same time, needed economic assistance reached friendly free nations in Southeast Asia and in the Pacific area which effectively checked internal Communist threats and strengthened and stabilized the governments concerned.

Once a start had been made on the road back to stability, the North Atlantic Treaty was drafted. It declared that an attack on one member of the pact was an attack on all. This gave heart to the individual members, particularly the smaller members, by assuring them that if they were attacked they would not have to fight alone. The treaty served notice on any potential aggressor that the old totalitarian technique of picking off victims one by one would no longer work. The treaty recognized that if the underlying principle of collective security—a joint defense based on self-help and mutual aid—was to be applied, a political framework had first to be constructed.

This principle was expressly recognized in the United Nations Charter. It followed the pattern of the Organization of American States and is in turn being duplicated by the proposed Pacific security arrangements and for the proposed Middle East Command.

To give the initial impetus to these defense agreements, the United States launched the Mutual Defense Assistance Program and followed up with the combined economic and military aid which is now going forward under the Mutual Security Program.

In December 1950, at the Brussels conference, the North Atlantic Treaty powers agreed to a Unified Command of their forces in Europe. General Eisenhower took command of these forces. After the great debate, the United States dispatched additional troops to Europe as part of this force. On the military side both General Eisenhower and General Gruenther have said that gratifying progress has been made. On the political side, this action has also had important effects. It showed the people of Europe that we regard them as important. It showed them that they had not been consigned to the fate of being overrun, devastated, and then liberated. It made possible more progress toward the unification of Europe than has occurred in the past one thousand years. It made possible the Schuman Plan, the discussions concerning the European defense forces, and the European Defense Community.

These discussions played a key part in restoring Germany to a place in the family of free nations. It is extremely important to the people of Europe that their defense perimeter included Western Germany. It is obviously common sense that the German people take part in the defense of their own territory. How could this be worked out without risking a rebirth of German militarism and without imposing conditions offensive to German dignity and their wish for equality, which are essential to their willing and enthusiastic participation?

We should like to see the peaceful unification of a free Germany. This was the United States' objective when it sponsored the recent U. N. resolution on Germany. Under that resolution a U. N. commission was created to investigate whether the necessary conditions for free elections existed in all of Germany. We support this resolution and welcome the commission. However, the history of Communist obstruction, and specifically the Communist refusal to permit the commission to enter Eastern Germany, does not lead us to hope that this objective can be reached in the immediate future.

Britain, France, and the United States are working toward an end of the occupation by a series of contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic, thus restoring the fullest German sovereignty possible in the present situation. At Lisbon, NATO approved the creation of a European

Defense Community, in which West Germany would participate as an equal member. West German troops would participate in the European defense forces. The strength and unity of the European community is the primary safeguard against the revival of aggressive militarism.

I believe these steps, the Unified Command under General Eisenhower, and the progress toward a unified European community, represent real accomplishments. It has not been accomplished without assistance from the United States. There have been large amounts of American aid, money which has come out of your pocket. This year it is going to require more. The present foreign assistance program calls for 7.9 billion dollars.

With a program of this magnitude, a responsible administration must answer the question "If our policy has been successful, why do we need all this money?"

Reasons for Financial Aid

Of this amount, 4 billion dollars is for military equipment and 1.8 billion dollars is in defense support—that is, funds to enable the North Atlantic countries to obtain machinery, equipment, and commodities which they must have if they are to maintain sound economies capable of carrying their heavy defense burdens.

Let us consider what these burdens are. Our European allies had to start building their military forces almost from scratch. Since 1949 they have doubled their military budgets. Each has lengthened its period of military conscription. Military production in Europe has been expanded almost four times beyond the 1949 level. More than half a million men have already been added to their military forces on active duty. Even more vital has been the steady conversion of these troops into effective combat units, through improved organization. All told, the number of combat divisions available in Europe has doubled since General Eisenhower assumed command last spring.

The European citizen who has made this achievement possible has an income one-third of his American prototype. He pays about the same percentage of his meager income in taxes. He has yet to recover completely from the personal losses he sustained during the war. And on top of these difficulties, since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, the stepped-up program of rearmament has pushed prices up twice as fast as the rise experienced in this country. Finally, in certain countries such as Britain and France, the Governments have assumed heavy commitments in defense of the other parts of the free world. The share of the program which our friends are undertaking at the present time comes pretty close to the limit of their capacities. To try to go beyond these limits might produce a strain on their eco-

nomic and political structures which would endanger both their security and ours.

I have made these references to military strength because a defensive shield is an essential part of United States policy. This aspect of our policy is by no means an end in itself. The United States is not trying to beat the Soviet Union at its own militaristic game. It is not trying to match them gun for gun and tank for tank. We are merely trying to make impossible the bargain-basement conquest so dear to Soviet hearts. It is important that this be understood throughout the entire world.

Last fall, in the General Assembly, the United States took a leading role in proposing a workable system of world disarmament. As a result of this a disarmament commission was established, which is now meeting in New York. At first glance, having spoken at such length about building collective military strength, it would appear somewhat contradictory to speak of our desire to reach agreement on the reduction of all armaments. But on further examination, there is no conflict. The free world is not increasing its military strength as an end in itself. It is doing so because it is compelled to by Soviet policy.

The very development of sufficient strength against aggression may convince the Kremlin that aggression can never again be profitable. It may convince the Kremlin that its self-interest requires sincere steps to reach genuine enforceable agreements for the reduction and control of armaments.²

I would like to dwell on this disarmament proposal because it presents two important aspects of our war of ideas with the U. S. S. R. Like it or not, we are now engaged with the U. S. S. R. in a struggle for the minds of men. We can win this struggle only if we convince the people of the world that the United States wants to have peace and a chance to improve their lot, while the promises of the U. S. S. R., despite the tinsel, offer only despotism and slavery.

Purpose of Disarmament Proposals

A vital component in this struggle is the good faith of the United States. The proposals we are making in the hope of easing international tensions are seriously made. For example, the disarmament offer to the Soviet Union is drafted with no little effort and much care, so that it can be accepted by the Soviet Union if they are really interested in a general reduction in armed forces. The United States will be overjoyed if the Soviet Union agrees to use our proposals as a basis of negotiation. We are fully prepared to go through with our part of the bargain. There are some

² For text of the disarmament resolution, see BULLETIN of Mar. 31, 1952, p. 507.

people who feel that the Soviet opposition to the disarmament proposal in Paris shows that they are not interested in disarmament. They immediately tab our proposal propaganda. This is a serious mistake and one which should not be repeated. The United States Overseas Information Service capitalized on the United States proposal to the fullest. But the reason that it is effective in the campaign of truth is basically because we are serious about it. That is where the element of good faith enters. The people in other parts of the world that we are trying to reach have had their fill of empty maneuvers.

This is our advantage over communism in the war of ideas.

The disarmament problem presents another aspect of what might at first glance appear to be a disadvantage under which we are fighting in our war of ideas with the U.S.S.R. The reduction and regulation of armaments, particularly atomic weapons, is a very complex subject. It requires consideration of such matters as a census, the levels to which disarmament should be carried, and detailed provisions for safeguards and inspection to see that the safeguards are being carried out. In the atomic energy field in particular these safeguards are very complicated. When we make a proposal, we make one which we would be prepared to live with if it were accepted, and one which contains the safeguards necessary for others to feel the same way. The Soviet Union labors under no such restriction. In the atomic energy field, for example, they have urged the simple outlawing of the bomb, even though at the same time they would retain the fissionable materials from which a bomb could be made in a very short time. Against this simple slogan we must use relatively complicated, though workable, proposals. We often appear to be preoccupied with procedure.

The same adherence to simple slogans, whether workable or not, appears in other fields. In the field of German elections, the Soviet Union urges "All-German elections" and leaves it to others to deal with the unpleasant fact that a free election cannot be held under the heel of the secret police and under the shadow of the concentration camp. In the Genocide Convention the U.S.S.R. shouts for the outlawing of genocide, but objects to provisions which would permit the world to determine whether this heinous crime has been committed on the Estonians, Letts, and Lithuanians.

As I said earlier, at first blush this would appear to be a disadvantage in the war of ideas. In the world of advertising it is, I believe, a truism that short simple slogans sell more soap than complicated explanations. But a habit of making only serious, workable offers in international affairs and for dealing only in the truth, no matter how complex, will not be a handicap in the war of ideas if we conduct ourselves wisely and vigorously.

The essential difference between our position in

all these matters and that of the Soviet Union is that in these important matters—sometimes going to the very heart of national security—we do not limit ourselves to mere promises. We are prepared to set up machinery so that the representatives of all countries can go into all other countries and satisfy themselves and their people that what is being promised is being done. Here are the short, simple slogans which we can use to sell democracy. It is that we have no Iron Curtain, no secret police. It is that we are prepared to give real security for our international promises, that we propose effective controls. It is that we have nothing to conceal; it is that the peoples of other countries can satisfy themselves that we want peace. It is that they can satisfy themselves that in transmitters, the moving pictures, and the printed matter which carry news and ideas we are not dealing in propaganda. We are dealing in the facts of American life. We are showing what can be done by men in societies where men are free. We are thus striking at a soft spot in the monolith of communism. The Iron Curtain was dropped to prevent the penetration of these ideas because they constitute the one area where rigid Soviet controls cannot be applied.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Telecommunications, Use of Facilities of Radio Ceylon. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2259. Pub. 4274. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Ceylon—Signed at Colombo May 12 and 14, 1951; entered into force May 14, 1951.

Designation of Permanent Free Port Area in Liberia. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2267. Pub. 4295. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Liberia—Signed at Monrovia July 24 and 26, 1948; entered into force July 26, 1948.

Germany, Prohibited and Limited Industries. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2250. Pub. 4322. 24 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom and France—Signed at Frankfort Apr. 14, 1949; entered into force Apr. 14, 1949.

Claims, Looted Securities. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2275. Pub. 4324. 27 pp. 10¢.

Memorandum of understanding between the United States and the Netherlands with note—Signed at Washington Jan. 19, 1951; entered into force Jan. 19, 1951.

Problems Facing Underdeveloped Areas in Asia and Africa

PREPARING FOR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE THROUGH SOUND CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

*by Ambassador Francis B. Sayre
U.S. Representative in U.N. Trusteeship Council¹*

My topic this evening is a world problem, as tremendous in its proportions, as profound in its far-reaching consequences as the stupendous struggle now raging between Soviet Russia and the free world. It is the problem of the world's far-flung underdeveloped areas. It affects directly the question of world peace or war in the twenty-first century. Upon its successful solution hangs the further advance of civilization. Just what is this problem?

Three Poison-Breeding Factors

It is the perilous situation resulting today in large parts of Asia and in most of Africa from the conjunction of three poison-breeding factors:

First. A condition of appalling human need. It is not that the peoples in large parts of Asia and Africa lack merely the good things of life. They are born into a lifelong struggle against desperate hunger, against disease that saps their strength, against ignorance and illiteracy that shuts out hope. Living standards in most of Asia and Africa are the lowest in the world. In many sections, life expectancy at birth is only 32 years. One out of every three babies dies before reaching its first birthday. Those suffering from malaria in Asia today equal the total population of the Western Hemisphere—and every year three million of these sufferers die. Tuberculosis, malaria, and yaws are rampant. All are controllable diseases. Monstrous illiteracy bars the door to spiritual or technological advance. More people in Asia and Africa are unable to read a word from a printed book or direction than inhabit the whole of Europe and of the United States.

Second. Embittering memories of cruel racial discrimination and exploitation which accompanied much of nineteenth century colonialism. These have left livid scars. Racial inferiority complexes have been generated; and these today offer serious hindrances to Western attempts to build bulwarks for freedom. The poison of racial hatred has bred among many people in Asia and Africa profound distrust, and in some cases fear, of all white peoples.

Third. Surging forces of nationalism. Earlier conditions which made for isolation of underdeveloped peoples have been largely swept away by modern commerce, the radio and world-scale military activities. In consequence, Asia and Africa today, emerging from the primitive conditions which have locked them in for centuries, are being confronted with twentieth-century problems which they scarcely understand and for which they are quite unprepared. The result is the high explosive of nationalism. Even nations which have recently achieved independent statehood are often rabidly nationalistic. Many of these peoples, freed from the fetters of colonialism and awakening to the world around them, are beginning to feel the striking disparity between the peoples of the Western world, in their eyes luxuriating in plenty, and themselves, lacking even the bare essentials of existence. At the same time, they, like the populace of France in 1789, are tasting new-found power. For, however successfully it may be curbed for a time by political institutions or popular ignorance, power ultimately rests in the hands of the people. Millions of men and women living in the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa, more and more insistently are asking why they should live as the disinherited people of the world.

It is the conjunction of these three interrelated factors—desperate human need, the feeling of re-

¹ Address made before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences at Boston, Mass., on Apr. 9 and released to the press by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. on the same date.

sentment bred by long years of cruel racial discrimination, and an explosive, new-found nationalism—that constitutes the problem of underdeveloped peoples in Asia and Africa. Here is a problem which must be comprehended and met today if we are to have world peace in the twenty-first century. Even if the Soviet state collapsed tomorrow, there could be no assurance of world peace until this problem is mastered. For peace depends inescapably upon human freedom; and in the face of desperate hunger and need, of deep-rooted racial hatreds, of the sudden acquisition of power by peoples quite unprepared for its responsibilities, there can be no genuine freedom.

The March Toward Political Independence

Significant surface tide rips now and again reveal these strong deep-moving currents at work. At Paris last November and December in the General Assembly, one felt their power in the debates of the Fourth Committee [Trusteeship], where the representatives of some 60 nations deal with problems of trusteeship and dependent peoples. Of these 60 nations, eight administer the territories of dependent peoples and are responsible for their governance. Some 50 do not carry such responsibility, although within the borders of many of them live primitive peoples whose life is much the same as that of peoples in non-self-governing areas. Consequently, in the Fourth Committee, in spite of support from some nonadministering delegations, the 8 administering powers can be hopelessly outvoted.

The issues underlying the current Fourth Committee debates are basic. Certain peoples, isolated from the busy pathways of mankind, are today underdeveloped and lack the modern resources, the training, and the experience to govern themselves competently or to defend themselves against possible attack by aggressor states.

Leading Western nations during past centuries, with or without right, have entered the territories of many of these peoples and successfully exercised control and government over them. Under the system of national sovereignty as developed in international law they consider today their right to control these people and to exercise sovereignty over them legally and constitutionally unassailable.

But, during the last hundred years, throughout the world has come an awakening social consciousness and a deepening sense of the sanctity of those human rights which must lie at the foundation of every lasting world order. As a result, men and women everywhere today are questioning the right of one people to govern and control another against the latter's consent; and the challenge is being pressed not only by dependent peoples but also by many other nations which themselves possess no colonial territories. However strongly entrenched in law and in constitu-

tional theory may be the colonial powers' right to rule an alien people, there is a growing popular tendency today to shift the issue from constitutional to moral considerations. The resulting pressures are intensified by old resentments against nineteenth century colonialism.

The march toward political independence within recent years has been assuming dramatic proportions. Moved by a complex of motives and forces, hastened by the pressures of world opinion, the great colonial powers today in numerous instances are giving up former possessions or putting a time limit on the continuance of their rule. Since the Second World War some 500 million people—a fifth of the entire population of the world—have won political independence.

Solving New Problems of Independence

But with independence come new problems; and genuine freedom is not to be had until a way can be found to solve them.

LIBYA

Examples abound. Libya as a result of the vote of the General Assembly in 1949 has now become a "united, independent and sovereign State," and the occupying powers, Great Britain and France, have transferred all their governmental powers to the new Libyan Government as from December 24, 1951. Free and democratic national elections have already been held there and a new constitution has been inaugurated.

But independence carries with it inescapable responsibilities. Defense involves large outlays of money; so do necessary buildings and public works. So do adequate educational programs and public-health measures. So do schools and hospitals and training institutions for indigenous school teachers and doctors and nurses. Thus far the necessary revenues have for the most part come out of the treasuries of Great Britain and of France, the administering powers. Libya itself lacks sufficient revenues. The U.N. budget is not large enough to support the necessary expenditures. For the time being, Great Britain and France have promised to make good the deficits in the Libyan budget. During the current year the United Nations is advancing to Libya over a million dollars in technical assistance. Similarly, the United States is advancing about \$1,500,000 in technical assistance. But the question still remains: How will the Libyan people in the long run meet the necessary costs of economic and social and educational advancement? From where will the money come?

SOMALILAND

Or take another example. The people of the former Italian colony of Somaliland in 1950 were placed under Italian administration in accordance

with the vote of the General Assembly in 1949 and were promised their political independence at the end of 10 years. The civil expenditures in Somaliland for the past year were almost double the amount of receipts derived from the Territory itself. Local receipts totalled \$4,616,850, while civil expenditures amounted to \$8,463,140. The difference is made up by a direct contribution from the administering authority. The Government of Italy also assumed all obligations relating to the Security Corps. Also, it is worth noting that about 75 percent of the direct and indirect taxes in Somaliland are paid by Italians.

Experts express doubt whether Somaliland can ever be a viable state, with a high or even moderate level of government services. They question whether the country possesses sufficient natural resources or possibility of industrial development ever to produce the revenues necessary for an adequately governed self-sufficient state. In 1960, Italy, the administering power, steps out. What then?

Problems such as these face us today in many similar areas. Men and women are questioning the right of any nation to govern an alien people against their will. But the maintenance of independence and the development of economic and industrial resources cost money and require trained personnel. Where are they to come from? Surely the answer is not simple abandonment. Underdeveloped peoples cannot be left to live on in ignorance and want. Human progress imperatively demands that they be given a helping hand. In many of the underdeveloped areas in Asia and Africa, man has today perhaps his last opportunity to meet these extended problems with humane and Christian solutions. If he fails, can he be surprised if communism moves in?

Devising System of International Accountability for Dependent Peoples

Underlying the debates in the Fourth Committee is the effort on the part of many of the non-administering powers to widen the scope of international accountability for the government of dependent peoples beyond the point specifically agreed to by the eight administering powers in 1945 when the Charter was written and the international trusteeship system set up. How far can a system of international accountability for the government of dependent peoples be pushed? In other words, have the representatives of the 60 nations which are members of the United Nations the power to require the administering states to adopt such specific policies in the government of their dependent peoples as the Fourth Committee may decide upon by a majority vote?

The contest takes many different forms. Last November in the opening days of the session, the Fourth Committee voted to grant hearings to rep-

resentatives of the Ewe people, dwelling within the trust territories of French and British Togoland in West Africa. Since these representatives were invited to present their views in a controversy involving an international trust territory, there seemed little question as to the Fourth Committee's competence to grant the hearings. In fact, the United Kingdom representatives at the very outset spoke in favor of the invitation. This, however, was followed by a resolution similarly to grant a hearing to chiefs of the Herero, Nama, and Damara tribes dwelling in South-West Africa. South-West Africa is not a trust territory but a mandated territory set up by the League of Nations under the administration of the South African Union. The representative of the Union Government strongly protested that since South-West Africa is not a trust territory, such a resolution would be an unconstitutional intervention in their domestic affairs and thus a violation of their Charter rights. Others took a contrary view. Upon the passing of the vote, the Union delegation promptly withdrew from the Fourth Committee and boycotted its further proceedings.

There followed severe criticism by the representative of Guatemala upon British rule in British Honduras; and this in turn was followed by critical references by Greece to British rule in Cyprus and by Yemen to British administration in Aden. After a strong British protest there followed an attempt on the part of the Arab group to question French rule in Morocco. French Morocco is neither a trust territory nor under mandate. The representative of Iraq charged that the "lamentable position of Morocco" was basically due to the policy of colonialism pursued by France there. Every manifestation of nationalism, he asserted, was being harshly and sternly suppressed. The French representative, protesting the illegality of the proceeding, and asserting that he could not continue to take part in a debate which was wholly unconstitutional, walked out of the Committee.

In debating the legality of the proceedings most of the nonadministering powers took the position that the Fourth Committee was entirely competent to discuss political matters and political aspects not only in trust territories but in all non-self-governing territories as well, and a resolution to that effect was introduced. Running through many minds was the position strongly taken by certain nonadministering powers the preceding year that the Fourth Committee is competent by its vote to determine the specific policies which "the administering authorities are under a clear obligation to implement." Dark clouds began to gather over the Fourth Committee.

In the end, however, the Iraq representative agreed not to press the matter to a vote and the French representative returned to the Fourth Committee. But none of us could fail to realize

the deep-seated cleavages becoming manifest. Intense emotions had been aroused; far-reaching issues were at stake.

One must not overmagnify the seriousness of these incidents of last November. On the other hand, every flier must know the air currents upon which he depends. Storm signals are appearing in many quarters. It is not wise to ignore them. Failure to recognize and meet the problem of underdeveloped peoples in Asia and Africa can seriously injure the machinery of the United Nations, might seriously impair our chances for world peace in the years to come.

Relation of Underdeveloped Areas and Political Dependency

We must not become confused in our thinking. The problem of underdeveloped areas is not altogether the same as that of dependent peoples. Many dependent peoples, such for instance as those of Bermuda or Malta or Hawaii, possess a comparatively high degree of development, but prefer or need the continuing protection and assistance of a Great Power; whereas, on the other hand, some peoples, such as those in Libya, now possess political independence but remain as yet for the most part underdeveloped. Nevertheless, these two problems of underdevelopment and political dependency are intimately interrelated; in many areas of Asia and Africa they directly coincide.

Both reach deep into the heart of the problem of world peace.

World peace, as all of us know, can be built only upon human freedom. Yet today some 200,000,000 people are non-self-governing. What is the solution?

The easy but superficial answer is prompt independence for all. This is the answer which the Soviets beguilingly espoused at San Francisco when the U.N. Charter was being framed in 1945. It is an answer that has instant emotional appeal to almost everyone. It wins support in every General Assembly, particularly among the Latin American groups and those Middle Eastern states which have achieved their independence after long years of struggle.

We of America, perhaps more than any other people, believe that freedom is the rock upon which all human progress must be built. Without it there can be no democracy, no stable world peace.

Under its Charter, the United Nations is consecrated to the task of assisting all non-self-governing peoples in their progressive development toward independence or self-government. This is the deep purpose of every people outside of the Soviet ring.

Since the setting up of the United Nations, as has already been pointed out, some 500 millions of people have acquired political independence. Seven new nations of Asia—India, Pakistan, Cey-

lon, Burma, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, and Indonesia—have come into existence. To these must be added Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Israel in the Middle East; and in Africa, Libya, which was given independence last December. Somaliland, Nepal, the new states of Indochina, and others loom on the horizon.

But what so many people fail to understand is that political independence is not synonymous with human freedom. In 1783 the wresting of American independence from the British Crown was only the first step toward freedom. As a next step it took a constitutional bill of rights to guarantee freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom from illegal process. Thereafter it took the people of the independent nation many years of sustained effort to build the social and cultural foundations necessary to establish American freedom and make it reasonably secure. Indeed, we are still in the building process. As we move forward we continually gain new vision and new goals.

Genuine freedom cannot be achieved by mere political grant or military victory. It comes only as adequate foundations—political, economic, social, and educational—can be prepared for it.

In Somaliland, for instance, unless the people can, through actual experience and training, learn what majority rule by secret ballot means and accept the responsibilities that must go with democracy, unless the local revenues can be increased through rapid agricultural or industrial development to pay for sorely needed schools and teachers and hospitals and doctors, there will be no genuine individual human freedom there 10 years from now.

Political independence is a notable step along the way. But surely it is only a step, and in no sense the goal itself. Peoples can be as effectively manacled by economic and social forms of servitude as by political oppression. In other words, among the peoples living in many primitive parts of Asia and Africa, the real problems go far deeper than political status. In such areas genuine solutions can come only through slow processes of education and training in the fundamentals upon which successful self-government must be built.

When the United States undertook the administration of the Philippine Islands in 1898, in spite of insistent Filipino demands, we did not give them independence for almost half a century. Instead we sent among them armies of school teachers and doctors and road builders. We helped them to learn what democracy means in action and we gave them practical experience in the exasperating art of self-government.

The grant of premature political independence without adequate economic and social preparation for it can bring to a people untold harm. Indigenous leaders, unrestrained by the civic standards that come with widespread education, can exploit

their compatriots as ruthlessly as aliens or even more so. Neither can the cause of international peace be served by giving full independence to a people unable to defend themselves. Large parts of Asia and Africa today possess immense natural resources and offer exceedingly valuable strategic bases, but are inhabited by peoples quite unable to hold their own against lawless aggressors armed with twentieth-century weapons.

Our course is clear. If we are to have lasting peace, we must stimulate and help the peoples in all underdeveloped areas, self-governing as well as non-self-governing, to construct the kind of economic and social and educational foundations necessary to prepare them for maintaining their political freedom and to qualify them for increasing self-government.

Task of the U.N. Trusteeship Council

In this great task the United Nations is now engaged on a broad front through its principal organs and specialized agencies. These, for example, are the precise objectives of the Trusteeship Council for the trust territories of Africa and the Pacific. And it is along these lines in fact that significant and promising advances are actually being achieved today.

Of the six principal United Nations organs it is the Trusteeship Council which devotes its attention most directly to the struggle for human freedom in areas not yet prepared for full political independence.

Today 11 trust territories—7 in Africa and 4 in the Pacific—have been placed under the international trusteeship system. They embrace a population of some 18,000,000 people. It is true that only about a tenth of the non-self-governing peoples of the world live within the confines of trust territories. Nevertheless, among them the Trusteeship Council has a unique opportunity to point the pathway which leads to freedom for all.

I wish there were time to tell you something of the adventures of the Trusteeship Council along these pathways. I think of the people living in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa and of how, in 1947, their chiefs and leaders sent a petition to the Trusteeship Council asking for self-government. In response the Trusteeship Council promptly sent a mission to Samoa, composed of a Belgian, a Chilean, and myself. Assisting us were a Norwegian, a Frenchman, and a Brazilian, members of the Secretariat. We spent the summer in Samoa, studying the problem at first hand, visiting the Samoan villages, talking with the people. The mission reached unanimous conclusions. We recommended that immediate steps be taken to give Samoans a substantially greater measure of self-government. "Even a limited degree of self-government," declared our report, "involves risks which are not underestimated by the Mission. But these risks must be taken.

Training in self-government can come only through actual experience sometimes costly." We recommended among other things that a Government of Western Samoa should be established and that legislative power should be placed in the hands of a local legislature. We also recommended that Samoans should have an absolute majority in the legislature. Before the year was out the New Zealand Parliament had given to the Samoans a new government embodying substantially every one of our mission's recommendations.

It takes a visit to a trust territory to see what trusteeship really means. An inspection trip took me not long ago to the former Japanese islands of the Pacific, now a trust territory under U.S. administration. I went out questioning. I came back impressed.

During the period of the Japanese mandate, the peoples of the Islands had been given no training, no hope. War had hit the Islands hard. During my visit, I found that within the 2½ years since the United States had assumed its trusteeship responsibilities more than 100 local municipalities had been organized to give the inhabitants training in the ways of democratic government. Approximately 80 percent of the Islanders of voting age at present enjoy some form of suffrage. Almost every inhabited island today has its elementary schools. More than 90 percent of the children of school age are enrolled in local schools. Indigenous teachers are being taught in an effective training school at Truk, where once the Japanese were building their war machine. Disease has been drastically reduced. Malnutrition has been virtually eliminated. Indigenous medical assistants, dentists, and nurses, trained at Guam or at Suva, are carrying their ministrations throughout the islands.

Americans are winning a place in the hearts of the Pacific Islanders. Last year came a petition to the United Nations from Saipan, one of the Pacific Islands. "It is our fervent hope," reads the petition, "that all of the islands in the Northern Marianas be incorporated into the United States of America, either as a possession or as a territory, preferably as a territory." To their great disappointment the petition was not granted.

Throughout the trust territories, the inhabitants are learning in the crucible of experience what self-government and freedom really mean.

"But why force upon peoples who through the centuries have developed their own cultures and found happiness in them, a twentieth-century culture which they neither understand nor want?" many will ask. "Would it not make for the happiness of all to leave them unmolested in their own ways of life?"

The answer is that we have no choice in the matter. No one can stay the hand of advancing cultures—least of all in an age when insistent com-

mercial and military demands have knit all peoples into an inescapable unity. Western Samoa during the whole of the second half of the nineteenth century struggled unyieldingly to preserve its indigenous culture and its isolation from Western civilization. It was of no avail. Other attempts all tell the same story. In our present shrunken twentieth century world no people can successfully isolate their indigenous culture behind a Chinese Wall. Each people has incalculable contributions to be given to humanity. Our twentieth-century life demands that every people make its peculiar contributions and together share our differing cultures.

Coordination of Economic Assistance Programs

Once we know the direction in which to work, we must not be dismayed by the magnitude of the task. The exciting fact is that today this problem of underdeveloped areas is being intelligently attacked as never before. The attack is on an international scale, in the main by the United Nations but also by the coordinated efforts of individual states.

Food is one of the paramount issues. As José de Castro has aptly said: "Only by raising the buying power and consuming capacity of the under-nourished two-thirds of the world can the other third survive and prosper. Isolationism can be as dangerous in the matter of food consumption as in the realm of war and politics."

The U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization (FaO) is laboring manfully to increase food supplies throughout the world. It is showing many peoples the superiority of the plow to the hoe, of modern scientific agriculture to archaic methods of tilling the fields. Even so, progress is slow. Two months ago I was watching Arabs plowing their fields in northern Morocco. The plows consisted of the twisted branches of trees. Iron plows were beyond the workers' reach.

Power development, flood control, irrigation projects cost money and cannot be put through without capital from the outside. In the past fiscal year, 1951, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made 21 loans for development projects in 11 countries totaling nearly 300 million dollars.

For the first year of an expanded program of technical assistance and economic development, 54 governments pledged to the U.N. Technical Assistance Board over 20 million dollars. Nearly 19 million dollars has been pledged so far for the 1952 program. Up to June 30, 1951, more than 500 requests had been received from 64 countries and territories. At that date 252 projects had been initiated or approved through agreements with 45 countries providing for 741 experts and 551 fellowships. From further agreements, then under negotiation, projects requiring the services

of 674 experts and 590 fellowships were expected to result.

Separate nations are also engaging in this considerable effort. The U.S. total program of technical assistance excluding its contribution to the United Nations amounts to more than 200 million dollars. This is part of the appropriation of 1 billion, 440 million dollars voted by Congress last October 31 for economic and technical cooperation. The United Kingdom in 1945 passed the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, setting aside £120,000,000 to promote the development and welfare of the colonies. Other administering powers are pushing forward in similar developments.

Difficulties abound. Economic-assistance programs cannot be rammed down the throats of undesiring recipients. At least one non-Communist country has refused the offer of American technical assistance because of their fear or misunderstanding of our motives. Also, innovations may arouse the opposition of tribal chiefs or the holders of vested rights. Then, again, old time subsistence economies, easygoing and never exacting, are often of greater appeal than increased revenues. Progress as conceived of in our Western cultures is not coveted by every people, particularly if it involves the abandonment of ancestral ways of life.

The building of economic foundations for freedom clearly involves more than handing out in backward areas dollars or pounds or francs for expenditure. Like all effective work for human progress it requires a deep understanding of the people concerned, tempered with infinite patience and wisdom. It will not succeed unless wrought with an abiding faith in the dignity and worth of every personality, regardless of the color of his skin or his unfamiliarity with formal education. We have still a long, long way to go. Nevertheless, economic progress is being achieved—more rapidly it would seem and on a more extended scale than ever before in human history.

The Importance of Adequate Social Foundations

Adequate social foundations are as necessary as economic ones. In the space of less than 3 years the United Nations has secured the adoption of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is not a treaty, not a law, but a definition of goals. But it has already had an important impact upon the thinking of mankind. The treaty on genocide, now ratified by 35 nations, is an attempt to outlaw the practice of mass extermination of peoples.

Basic among social problems is, of course, that of disease. Sick men cannot till their lands. In this field another U.N. agency, the World Health Organization (Who), is mobilizing attack upon an international scale. The Trusteeship Council

is also constantly at work, pioneering in the trust territories in the field of social problems. For instance, in a recent report covering the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, the former German colony of East Africa, the following problems are listed as having come under the Council's consideration: social welfare and security, population pressure and movement, standard of living, housing, child marriage, immigration, general labor conditions, wage rates, trade-unions, labor disputes, labor conventions and legislation, cooperative societies, medical services, hospitals, dispensaries, clinics, and prisons.

In this field perhaps the most profound and baffling problem of all is racial discrimination. One thing we know. Brazen racial discrimination undermines the position of the white man in the world community. Change will come; and it is greatly to the interest of the white race to help to guide rather than to impede that change. In a number of areas the problem is being solved—and successfully solved along the lines pointed out by courageous missionaries for many years. They call it the pathway of human brotherhood. The peoples of the United Nations at the very outset of the Charter pledged themselves to a "faith in fundamental human rights," and "in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

As a matter of fact, experience over many years has shown that when colonial administration is based upon the exploitation of human beings, it has bred only difficulties and well-nigh insuperable problems. On the other hand, when colonial administration has come to be based upon the conception of sharing common problems and common fortunes, stable and reasonably satisfactory solutions have generally been reached. One thinks of New Zealanders and Maoris, of Americans and Filipinos. Wise colonial administration recognizes the oneness of the human race.

Developing Ideals of Human Progress

Another and perhaps the most necessary foundation for human freedom, particularly among primitive and tribal peoples, lies in the field of education. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free," wrote Thomas Jefferson, "it expects what never was and never will be." In Asia, Africa, and the South Pacific, many peoples still lack any comprehension of what human progress outside their own static cultures means.

In the weird Cargo Cult of the South Pacific, one gains a glimpse of the thought processes of the primitive mind. Among these peoples runs an unquestioning belief in magic, in the power of the fetish, in unholy spells. Struck with the utterly inexplicable power of foreigners to produce, as from the skies, inexhaustible supplies of ships and

guns and food and kerosene stoves and machine monsters of indescribable power, certain South Pacific peoples under the spell of the Cargo Cult, perhaps touched by a misunderstood conception of sacrifice gained from Christian missions, will take it upon themselves with sudden decision to destroy everything they possess—to tear down their houses, burn their pathetic belongings, chop down their trees and root up their gardens, in a fine gesture of faith and hope that their gods or ancestors will thus be induced to send to them, too, even as to the foreigners, miraculous machines and a wealth of food.

As a general rule in underdeveloped areas there is an intense eagerness for modern schooling rather than resistance to it. In most such areas it is far easier to get children to come to school than to provide sufficient schools and sufficient trained teachers to teach them. One cannot plan an educational program based upon the use of foreign teachers for a population running into millions or even tens of millions. Manifestly there are not enough foreign teachers to be had. Adequate training schools where indigenous teachers can be trained constitute the keystone of any effective program for widespread education. Into these must be gathered the most promising boys and girls of the territory. This all takes time and costs large outlays of money.

There is also the crucial question of what to teach. It will do no good to give to primitive peoples a classical education. People living in primitive or tribal conditions must learn, not higher mathematics or ancient history, but how to make life more meaningful and rewarding for themselves and their fellows and how to improve the conditions under which they live.

The problem of underdeveloped areas in Asia and Africa cannot be solved in a night. It requires endless effort along a hundred different fronts. Its solution can come only through patient, untiring constructive work, and not through mass destruction.

But the great fact is that the free peoples of the world are comprehending ever more clearly the underlying issues and concentrating upon the constructive way forward. Measurable progress is being made.

The fight for freedom is a twofold fight. It involves not only resistance to political oppression but also emancipation of men and women from the shackles of hunger, disease, and ignorance. Both are necessary. Victory in one field contributes to victory in the other.

Soviet communism will not win. Neither authoritarianism nor ruthless dictatorship can ever permanently prevail. Free men working together throughout the world for human freedom possess matchless power. Today they are uniting as never before. Their power is unconquerable.

Educational Exchange Agreement With South Africa

[Released to the press March 26]

The Union of South Africa and the United States on March 26 signed an agreement putting into operation the program of educational exchanges authorized by Public Law 584, 79th Cong. (the Fulbright Act). The signing took place at Capetown with J. H. Viljoen, Minister of Education, Arts and Science, representing the Union of South Africa, and Waldemar J. Gallman, American Ambassador to the Union of South Africa, representing the Government of the United States.

In signing the agreement which is the twenty-fourth to be concluded under the Fulbright Act, Ambassador Gallman said:

It gives me great pleasure to sign, on behalf of my government, this agreement for financing educational exchange programs. I am sure that a wider exchange of knowledge and professional talent through personal contact will promote cooperation between our two countries in a most constructive way.

In reply, the Minister of Education, Arts and Science expressed his thanks to the Government of the United States for this

act of friendship designed to further closer cooperation, mutual understanding and respect between our countries. We in distant South Africa are already greatly indebted to the American people for their generosity in having assisted many of our students financially or otherwise, either to undertake research work in this country or pursue their studies in the United States.

The agreement provides for an annual expenditure not to exceed the equivalent of approximately \$16,000 in South African currency for a period of 3 years to finance exchanges between that country and the United States for purposes of study, research, or teaching. The program will be financed from certain funds made available by the U.S. Government resulting from the sale of surplus property to the Union of South Africa.

All recipients of awards under this program are selected by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, appointed by the President of the United States.

Under the terms of the agreement, a U.S. educational foundation in the Union of South Africa will be established to assist in the administration of the program. The Board of Directors of the foundation will consist of four members, two of whom are to be citizens of the Union of South Africa and two to be citizens of the United States. The American Ambassador to the Union of South Africa will serve as honorary chairman of the Board.

After the members of the foundation in the Union of South Africa have been appointed and a program formulated, information about specific opportunities will be made public.

Military Assistance Agreement With Chile

The Departments of State and Defense announced on April 9 that a bilateral military-assistance agreement had been signed that day with the Government of Chile.¹

The American Ambassador in Santiago, Claude G. Bowers, and Eduardo Yrarazaval, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile, signed the agreement.

This is the fifth bilateral military-assistance agreement which the United States has concluded with another American Republic. The other agreements, all very similar, are with Peru, Ecuador, Cuba, and Brazil. Negotiations on two more, with the Governments of Colombia and Uruguay, are in progress. What is involved is the provision by the United States of military grant aid to strengthen the defense of the Western Hemisphere. This military-aid program for Latin American nations was authorized in the Mutual Security Act of 1951. It is designed to assist the countries concerned in developing their capabilities to join in carrying out missions important to the security of all the American Republics.

The bilateral military grant aid program is consistent with inter-American instruments already in effect, such as the Rio Treaty, the resolution on Inter-American Military Cooperation approved at the Washington Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics last year, and is in full conformity with the planning of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Conversations on Military Assistance Agreement With Uruguay

[Released to the press March 31]

The Departments of State and Defense announced conversations are being initiated on March 31 at Montevideo with the Government of Uruguay to study the possibility and desirability of concluding a bilateral military assistance agreement.

The American Ambassador at Montevideo, Edward L. Roddan, is being assisted by representatives of the Department of Defense in the conversations. They are being carried on under the terms of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which authorized a program of military grant-aid for Latin America.

¹ For text of agreement, see Department of State press release 267 of Apr. 9.

Power Credit for Colombia

The Export-Import Bank announced on April 1 its authorization of a credit of \$2,600,000 to the Empresa de Energia Electrica, S. A., Medellin, Colombia. The purpose of the credit is to assist in financing a hydroelectric power plant of 50,000 kw. capacity on the Rio Grande River near Medellin, transmission lines, and related facilities. Empresa de Energia Electrica, S. A., owned by the city of Medellin, serves the largest and most important industrial area in Colombia which has, however, lately been suffering from a power shortage.

The granting of the credit which the Bank has announced is in furtherance of the policy of supporting the power program of the Empresa. In 1944 the Bank extended a credit of \$3,500,000 to the Empresa for the same purpose.

The credit of \$2,600,000, which will be guaranteed by the Banco de la Republica, will bear interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum and is to be repaid over a 15-year period beginning in 1953.

Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, in announcing the credit said, "The availability of power is basic to the economic development of Colombia and the Export-Import Bank is very happy to be able to assist Colombia in this important development."

Point Four Agreement With El Salvador

With the signature in San Salvador April 4, 1952, of a Point Four general agreement between the Governments of the United States and El Salvador, there are now 33 countries with which general agreements have been signed. There have been cooperative technical programs in operation in El Salvador for the past 10 years. The new agreement provides for their continuation and possible expansion.

American Ambassador George P. Shaw signed the agreement for the United States and Foreign Minister Roberto E. Canessa for El Salvador. Wyman R. Stone, director of the Health, Welfare and Housing Division of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and other American and Salvadoran officials were present at the ceremonies.

An agricultural mission of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture has been engaged in extensive research and extension activities since 1942. A large demonstration farm and experimental station is operated by them in cooperation with Salvadoran technicians at San Andres and another at Santa Cruz Porillos.

A health and sanitation mission of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs has been in operation

in El Salvador since 1944. Its principal activities include the completion and partial equipment of two hospital-health centers, a tuberculosis pavilion and a national nursing school, and carrying out an extensive rural sanitation program emphasizing the provision of safe water supply and sewage systems. The Federal Security Agency, in September 1951, sent out a specialist in medical social work to develop this service in the hospital at San Salvador.

Investigations into the fishery resources of El Salvador are being conducted by a fisheries expert from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. He also will advise the Government on the modernization of the industry.

In January of last year, an education mission was sent out by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to inaugurate a vocational-education program and to assist in organizing the San Salvador technical school.

Today, there are 18 American technicians in El Salvador working with 620 Salvadoran specialists in various phases of the development program. Last year the American contribution to the program was \$307,900 and the Salvadoran contribution was \$553,000.

Trade Negotiations With Venezuela

[Released to the press April 11]

Formal negotiations with the Government of Venezuela to supplement and amend the trade agreement with that country which was signed on November 6, 1939, will begin according to present plans, at Caracas on April 18.

The head of the U.S. team for these negotiations will be Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., Deputy Director of the Office of Middle American Affairs of the Department of State. The other members of the team are William F. Gray, Office of South American Affairs of the Department of State; Harold P. Macgowan, Adviser on Trade Agreement Policy, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce; James H. Kempton, Agricultural Attaché, American Embassy, Caracas; Herbert E. Striner, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior; and G. Lucille Batchelder of the Office of Middle American Affairs of the Department of State who will serve as secretary of the delegation.

Formal announcement of the intention to negotiate a supplementary trade agreement with Venezuela was made on August 29, 1951.¹ U.S. participation in the negotiations will be under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended.

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 10, 1951, p. 433.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Sixth Regular Session of the General Assembly

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTION: PART I

by Paul B. Taylor

The U.N. General Assembly held its sixth regular session at Paris from November 6, 1951, to February 5, 1952. Around 4,000 persons—members of the Secretariat and of delegations from the 60 member countries, including 26 foreign ministers—attended all or part of the session, in addition to observers from a number of non-member states and from nongovernmental groups. Coverage of the meetings by press and radio services was probably greater than at any previous international meeting in history.

These annual meetings, participated in by the great majority of nations and attended by such a galaxy of leading personalities, have over the years become a powerful forum for the expression of governmental views on major foreign-policy issues. In it, all member states, through their ranking spokesmen, present their points of view. Naturally, the Assembly has been the outstanding forum for debate of the critical issues of our time—those between international communism on the one hand and the democratic countries on the other. But the scope of the discussions always extends more widely, dealing with a variety of economic, social, and political problems relating to all areas of the world. Moreover, the General Assembly has indispensable annual functions in the U.N. system: voting the U.N. budget, electing members of councils and other bodies, and reviewing, in its several committees, the varied work of the United Nations as a whole. Over and above these organizational functions, the General Assembly has increasingly become the principal political action body of the organization.

The U.S. representatives at the session were Dean Acheson, Warren R. Austin, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mike J. Mansfield, John M. Vorys, and Philip C. Jessup.

The alternate representatives included John Sherman Cooper, Ernest A. Gross, Benjamin V. Cohen, Anna Lord Strauss, and Channing H. Tobias.

Assembly Elections

At its opening meeting, the Assembly elected as its President, Ambassador Padilla Nervo of Mexico and, as the seven Vice Presidents, the heads of the delegations of China, France, Iraq, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, and Yugoslavia. The following committee chairmen were also elected:

First Committee (Political and Security) : Finn Moe (Norway)
Second Committee (Economic and Financial) : Prince Wan Waithayakon (Thailand)
Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) : Mrs. Ana Figueroa (Chile)
Fourth Committee (Trusteeship) : Max Henriquez Urena (Dominican Republic)
Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) : T. A. Stone (Canada)
Sixth Committee (Legal) : Manfred Lachs (Poland)

Later, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee elected Ambassador Sarper of Turkey as its chairman.

Each year the Assembly elects new members of the U.N. councils to replace those whose terms have expired. It elected Chile, Pakistan, and Greece for 2-year terms on the Security Council. The third vacancy—the seat formerly held by Yugoslavia—was filled only on the 19th ballot. The United States and a number of other countries strongly supported Greece for that post; Byelorussia, the Soviet candidate for the vacancy, did, however, receive substantial backing. To fill the vacant seats in the Economic and Social Council, Argentina, Belgium, China, Cuba, Egypt, and France were elected for the coming 3-year term. Argentina then resigned its seat on the Trusteeship Council and the Assembly elected El Salvador in its place. Six vacancies had to be filled, by the Assembly and the Security Council, on the International Court of Justice—one caused by the death of a judge, five by the expiration of terms of office. Judge Carneiro (Brazil) was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Azevedo.

The following five judges were elected for the full term: Judge Golunsky (U.S.S.R.), Judge Hackworth (U.S.), Judge Klaestad (Norway), Judge Rau (India), Judge Ugon (Uruguay).

Major Political Issues

The Paris session of the General Assembly offered great potentialities for influencing public opinion on critical issues. The countries of the free world had for some years been engaged in a sustained build-up of military and economic strength against, first, the threat and, later, the actuality of Communist aggression. This undertaking involved hard and long sacrifices for many countries. The Soviet Union attempted in the General Assembly to divide and split the countries of the free world, charging that the United States is bent on war, that it refuses to make peace in Korea, and that it is forcing an armaments race on the world and thus causing economic disaster to many populations. In contrast, Andrei Vyshinsky and other Soviet spokesmen pictured the Soviet Union as a true champion of peace and disarmament and conciliation. These charges were squarely met, and it can be said that the Soviet Union failed completely to achieve a weakening of the free-world effort. On the contrary, the great majority showed their determination to persevere in the collective U.N. action in Korea and in carrying out other major programs undertaken in previous years, such as the development of capacity for more effective U.N. measures against any future aggression.

Political conditions existing at the beginning of the session also brought to the fore a number of new and critical issues relating particularly to the Middle East and Arab States. The strong nationalist movements in this broad area, which had already been reflected in such matters as the oil controversy in Iran and the controversy between Egypt and the United Kingdom over the Suez Canal, gave great emphasis in the General Assembly to the problem of Morocco and to the general issues of self-determination and the operation of the trusteeship system.

Disarmament

On November 7, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States announced that they would submit joint proposals for proceeding with the regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments, including atomic weapons.¹ Reaffirming their determination to develop the strength required for their security and that of the free world, they declared their belief that if all states would sincerely join in disarmament efforts the security of all nations would be increased. A few hours later President Truman,

in a radio address to the American people, explained the new disarmament proposals, making clear that they were the result of long and careful preparations.² He said that although the United States is determined to build up the necessary defenses of the free world, we would much prefer to see nations cut down their armaments on a basis that would be fair to everyone. The two U.N. Commissions heretofore working in the armaments field—the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments—should be consolidated into one, and this new Commission should consider the tripartite proposals. The proposals contained three principal points:

(1) A continuing inventory of all armed forces and all armaments should be undertaken in every country having substantial military power and should be checked and verified in each country by impartial U.N. inspectors.

(2) While this process of inventory and inspection was taking place, nations would work out specific arrangements for the actual reduction of armed strength.

(3) On the basis of (1) and (2), reductions should be made as soon as possible with full knowledge and fairness to all.

On November 8, Secretary Acheson, in his speech in the general debate, outlined the proposals further and asked that the item be included in the agenda of the Assembly.³

Soviet Foreign Minister Vyshinsky made his reply the following day. He ridiculed the proposals as a dead mouse brought forth by a mountain and said he had been kept awake all the previous night laughing at the proposals. He advanced Soviet proposals on the same subject along the lines of previous rejected Soviet proposals. Vyshinsky's cynical remarks brought about an immediate indignant reaction throughout the world; it was noted that the controlled press in the Soviet and satellite countries made no reference to the incident, and Vyshinsky took the unprecedented step of making a second address in the general debate. In this speech he once more criticized the tripartite plan and introduced amended Soviet proposals.

In the Political and Security Committee Secretary Acheson presented the tripartite proposals on November 19.⁴ After considerable discussion, a number of the smaller states, particularly those in Asia and the Middle East, urged that direct negotiations on the problem take place at once between the great powers. Accordingly, the Committee on November 30 established a subcommittee consisting of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United

¹ *BULLETIN* of Nov. 19, 1951, p. 802.

² *Ibid.*, p. 803.

³ *Ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1951, p. 879. (See also correction *ibid.*, Jan. 14, 1952, p. 58.)

States, with Assembly President Padilla Nervo as chairman, to seek by private discussion to formulate mutually acceptable proposals. The subcommittee began its meetings on December 3, and on December 10 President Padilla Nervo reported on the areas of agreement and disagreement between the three Western Powers on the one hand and the U.S.S.R. on the other—the areas of agreement being largely in the field of procedures.⁵ On December 13 the Three Powers submitted a revision of their resolution, to include elements to which the U.S.S.R. and the three had agreed in the subcommittee and as many suggestions from other members as was possible. They also accepted certain separate amendments proposed by other members. On December 19 the Committee adopted the revised resolution, with some amendments, by 44 votes to 5 (Soviet bloc) with 10 abstentions. The proposals of the Soviet bloc which, as in previous years, failed to provide safeguards against violations, were overwhelmingly rejected. On January 11 the Assembly approved the Committee's action by 42 votes to 5 with 7 abstentions.

This resolution established a single Disarmament Commission composed of the members of the Security Council plus Canada, and it directed the Commission to prepare proposals to be embodied in draft treaties for (1) the regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments; (2) the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction; and (3) effective international control of atomic energy to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. The resolution laid down certain principles to guide the Commission in its work. These included provision for progressive disclosure and verification on a continuing basis of all armed forces and armaments. In the atomic energy field, the U.N. plan is to serve as the basis for international control unless a better and more effective system is devised. This disarmament resolution constitutes the most important achievement of the session.⁶

Other Political Questions

The crucial problem of Korea was on the agenda in the form of the reports of the U.N. commissions working on different aspects of that problem. The United States and, in fact, practically all members agreed that to discuss the problem while the armistice negotiations were still in progress would not help these negotiations and might well hinder them. On the other hand, the Soviet delegation tried unsuccessfully from time to time to force a debate on Korea, doubtless hoping to confuse the issue or to improve the position of the Communist negotiators by transferring the discussions to

⁵ *Ibid.*, Jan. 7, 1952, p. 17.

⁶ For text, see *ibid.*, Mar. 31, 1952, p. 507.

Paris. Since the armistice negotiations continued at Panmunjom throughout the session, the Assembly, on the final day, adopted a proposal submitted by the United States, United Kingdom, and France that provided for a special session of the General Assembly to deal with Korea in case of an armistice or of other developments which make consideration of the problem desirable. The resolution was adopted by the overwhelming majority of 51 to 5 (Soviet bloc) with 2 abstentions.⁷

The Assembly carried further its collective-measures program under the resolution on Uniting for Peace adopted at the preceding session. The Collective Measures Committee established by that resolution had, during 1951, made a significant study of the means by which preparations could be made for more effective United Nations collective action if in a future case such action were undertaken. The United States and 10 other members of the Collective Measures Committee jointly introduced a resolution designed to carry forward the work. This resolution, with a number of amendments, was adopted by the Assembly by 51 votes to 5 (Soviet bloc) with 3 abstentions.⁸ In the resolution the Assembly took note of the Collective Measures Committee report, continued the Committee for a further year, and, in effect, recommended the continuation and further development of the collective-measures program initiated by the 1950 resolution on Uniting for Peace.

The Yugoslav representative introduced a complaint against the Soviet group's hostile activities toward it, and in his main speech he made a detailed indictment of the conduct of all these states. The Assembly adopted, by 50 votes to 5 (Soviet bloc) with 2 abstentions, a Yugoslav resolution recommending in general that the governments concerned conduct their relations in accordance with the Charter.⁹

On a proposal by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States the Assembly adopted, by 45 votes to 6 (Soviet bloc plus Israel) with 8 abstentions, a resolution appointing an impartial U.N. Commission to carry out a simultaneous investigation in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Berlin, and in the Soviet zone of Germany in order to determine whether existing conditions there make possible the holding of genuinely free elections throughout these areas.¹⁰

The members of the Arab League submitted a complaint entitled "Violations of the Charter and of Human Rights in Morocco." A General Committee recommendation that consideration of the question of inclusion of this item in the agenda be postponed for the time being was adopted by the General Assembly by 28 votes to 23 with 7 abstentions.

⁷ For text, see *ibid.*, Feb. 18, 1952, p. 260.

⁸ For text, see *ibid.*, Dec. 24, 1951, p. 1027.

⁹ For text, see *ibid.*, Jan. 14, 1952, p. 62.

¹⁰ For text, see *ibid.*, p. 55.

The Soviet Union and its satellites pressed a number of propaganda themes throughout the session, in addition to those relating to disarmament and Korea. They introduced a resolution condemning the United States for the adoption by Congress of the so-called Kersten amendment, which became section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and which authorized an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for "any selected persons who are residing in or escapees" from Iron Curtain countries "to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes."¹¹ The U.S.S.R. evidently sought through this complaint to brand the military assistance programs of the United States as intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and as designed to provoke war. The U.S. delegation flatly denied that Congress had ever intended the money to be used for any activities contrary to the U.N. Charter. On January 10, 1952, the Assembly by 42 votes to 5 (Soviet bloc) with 11 abstentions decisively rejected the Soviet charges.

In an omnibus resolution, the Soviet Union attempted to obtain Assembly approval of its own position concerning disarmament (even though the disarmament debate had been concluded and the resolution adopted), its proposals concerning Korea and a Five Power "peace pact," and its attempts to have the Assembly declare any participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization inconsistent with U.N. membership. The Assembly referred the Soviet disarmament proposals, together with the record of the debates, to the newly created Disarmament Commission; it rejected the other proposals.

The Assembly also dealt with a number of political problems which it had considered at previous sessions. Under earlier General Assembly resolutions, provision had been made for the independence of a united Libya by January 1, 1952. The United Kingdom of Libya was proclaimed as an independent state on December 24, 1951, and the General Assembly adopted a resolution designed to provide such further assistance as might be required and to achieve if possible its admission to the United Nations. On the Palestine question, the Assembly adopted, by a large majority, resolutions continuing the Palestine Conciliation Commission and providing for the adoption of a 3-year program, involving the expenditure of \$250,000,000, for the relief and reintegration of Palestine refugees.¹² In a resolution on the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, the Assembly continued the efforts to reach a conciliatory solution and called upon South Africa to suspend implementation of the Group Areas Act.

¹¹ For a statement by Mike J. Mansfield, U.S. delegate to the General Assembly, explaining the U.S. vote against this Soviet resolution, see *ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1952, p. 128.

¹² For text of the Palestine assistance resolution, see *ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1952, p. 226.

After consideration of the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans (UNSCOB), the General Assembly decided that the situation along Greece's northern frontiers had improved sufficiently to permit the dissolution of that 4-year-old watchdog body. At the same time, however, the Assembly provided for the establishment at New York of a Balkan subcommission of the Peace Observance Commission which would be available to conduct observation, on the request of states concerned, in any area of tension in the Balkans.

The admission of qualified states to membership was the subject of a Peruvian proposal adopted by the Assembly. The question of admission, the proposal stated, should be determined only on the basis of the Charter qualifications of the applicant, and it requested the Security Council to reconsider applications in accordance with this standard. A Soviet proposal requesting Security Council reconsideration of 13 applicants (omitting the Republic of Korea but adding Libya) received a majority vote in the Political Committee but failed to be adopted by the Assembly.

The problem of Chinese representation was raised once more by the U.S.S.R., this time in a request for inclusion of an item on this subject on the agenda.¹³ The Assembly adopted a resolution recommended by the General Committee rejecting inclusion of the Soviet item in the agenda and postponing for the duration of the meetings at Paris consideration of any further proposals to unseat the representatives of the National Government of China or to seat representatives of the Chinese Communist regime. The resolution was adopted by 37 votes to 11 with 4 abstentions. Another question relating to China was the complaint by China of Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1945. The Assembly adopted, by 25 votes to 9 with 24 abstentions, a resolution proposed by China finding that the U.S.S.R. had obstructed the efforts of the National Government of China in re-establishing Chinese national authority in Manchuria after the Japanese surrender and that it gave military and economic aid to the Chinese Communists against the National Government of China, and determining that the U.S.S.R. has failed to carry out the treaty of friendship and alliance of August 14, 1945,¹⁴ between China and the U.S.S.R.

• Mr. Taylor, author of the above article, is officer in charge of General Assembly Affairs for the Bureau of United Nations Affairs. He served as principal executive officer of the U.S. delegation to the Sixth General Assembly.

¹³ For statements by Secretary Acheson and Ambassador Warren R. Austin on this subject, see *ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1951, p. 917.

¹⁴ For text of the Chinese resolution, see *ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1952, p. 220.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Cannes Film Festival

The Department of State announced on April 9 that the Cannes International Film Festival will be held at Cannes, France, April 23-May 10, 1952. Chester A. Lindstrom, chief, Motion Picture Section, Department of Agriculture, will serve as U.S. delegate. Gerald M. Mayer, attaché, American Embassy, Paris, and formerly European representative of the Motion Picture Association of America, will serve as alternate U.S. delegate.

The object of this Festival is to encourage the development of the motion picture art in all its forms and to create and maintain a spirit of emulation and cooperation among all film producers in all countries. A number of prizes will be awarded at the Festival.

The U.S. exhibit will consist of the following three Government-produced documentary films: "River Run" (Department of Agriculture); "West Point" (Department of the Army); and "Demonstrations in Perceptions" (Department of the Navy). These films were selected by the Review Committee on Visual and Audio Materials, which is composed of representatives of 11 motion-picture producing agencies of this Government. In addition, the U.S. film industry will send several feature-length and documentary films for the competition at Cannes.

Sixth Hydrographic Conference

The Department of State announced on April 9 that the Sixth International Hydrographic Conference will convene at Monte Carlo, Monaco, on April 29, 1952. The U.S. delegation to this Conference is as follows:

Delegates

Capt. Earl O. Heaton, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce
Capt. George F. Kennedy, U.S.N.R., Navy Hydrographic Office, Department of Defense

Technical Advisers

H. R. Edmonston, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce
Guillermo Medina, Navy Hydrographic Office, Department of Defense
William G. Watt, Navy Hydrographic Office, Department of Defense

The International Hydrographic Conference serves as the deliberative and legislative assembly of the International Hydrographic Bureau. The Bureau was founded in 1921 for the purpose of

establishing a close and permanent association between the hydrographic services of the member states and of coordinating their efforts with a view to promoting easier and safer navigation on all of the seas of the world. Headquarters of the Bureau are located at Monte Carlo. United States participation in the Bureau was approved by an Act of Congress of March 2, 1921.

International hydrographic conferences are usually held quinquennially. The Fifth Conference was held at Monte Carlo, April 22-May 5, 1947. At the forthcoming Conference the activities of the Bureau during the last 5 years will be reviewed.

ITU: Seventh Session of Administrative Council

On April 9 the Department of State announced that Francis Colt de Wolf, Chief, Telecommunications Policy Staff, and U.S. representative on the Administrative Council of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), will attend the seventh session of the Council, which will convene at Geneva, Switzerland, on April 21, 1952. Mr. de Wolf will be assisted by the following advisers:

Donald C. Blaisdell, U.S. representative for Specialized Agency Affairs, Geneva, Switzerland
Helen G. Kelly, Telecommunications Policy Staff, Department of State
Wayne Mason, U.S. telecommunications attaché, American Legation, Bern; resident at Geneva, Switzerland

The establishment of the Administrative Council was provided for in the Atlantic City Telecommunication Convention (1947) and certain protocols annexed thereto. The Council functioned on a provisional basis until the Convention entered into force on January 1, 1949. The functions of the Council, which serves as the governing organ of the ITU, are to insure the efficient coordination of the work of the Union, to supervise the administrative functions of the Union, to deal with problems arising between plenipotentiary conferences, and to perform such other operations as may be delegated to it by plenipotentiary conferences. The Council, which is composed of 18 members of the Union, meets at least once a year. The last (sixth) session of the Council was held at Geneva, April 16-May 26, 1951.

At the forthcoming session the Council will consider the administrative and fiscal operations of the ITU. The agenda for the session is limited in view of the imminence of the Plenipotentiary Conference, which is scheduled to be held at Buenos Aires in October 1952.

Inter-American Travel Congress

On April 11 the Department of State announced that the Fourth Inter-American Travel Congress will convene at Lima, Peru, on April 12, 1952. The members of the U.S. delegation are as follows:

Paul C. Daniels, American Ambassador to Ecuador; *Chairman*
Jess B. Bennett, Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.
Franklin Moore, President, Inter-American Hotel Association, Harrisburg, Pa.
John D. J. Moore, U.S. Inter-American Council, Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, New York, N.Y.
Robert H. Wall, Assistant Chief, Travel Bureau, Department of Commerce
Laurin B. Askew, Assistant Attaché, American Embassy, Lima; *Secretary*

The purpose of the Fourth Inter-American Travel Congress is to encourage and promote tourist travel, a matter of economic and technical interest to all the countries of the Americas. The Council of the Organization of American States (Oas) adopted on January 16, 1952, a resolution in which the Congress was designated as an "Inter-American Specialized Conference" within the meaning of article 93 of the Charter of the Oas. In accordance with that resolution, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council prepared the program and regulations of the Congress in collaboration with its Organizing Committee.

The agenda includes consideration of such matters as organization of continuing activities in the travel field; economics of tourist travel; reduction or elimination of travel barriers; role of travel agencies in tourist interchange; resolutions affecting tourist travel approved at previous Congresses; travel-publicity techniques; facilities for organized groups of tourists; and policy and planning of tourist travel in the inter-American and national fields.

Invitations to participate in the Congress have been extended to all the governments of the American Republics, as well as to a number of international and nongovernmental organizations.

The previous (Third) Inter-American Travel Congress was held at San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina, February 15-24, 1949.

Commission on Narcotic Drugs

[Released to the press April 11]

Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury, and U. S. repre-

sentative on the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, will attend the seventh session of the Commission which will convene at New York, N. Y., on April 15, 1952. George A. Morlock, Office of U.N. Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State, and Alfred L. Tennyson, Chief of the Legal Division, Bureau of Narcotic Drugs, Department of the Treasury, will serve as advisers.

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which is one of the nine permanent functional commissions of the U.N. Economic and Social Council, was formally established on a permanent basis in 1946 to assume the functions and powers previously exercised by the League of Nations in the application of international conventions on narcotic drugs. The functions of the Commission include assisting the Council in exercising supervision over the application of international conventions and agreements dealing with narcotic drugs; advising the Council on all questions concerning the control of narcotic drugs and preparing draft international conventions thereon; and considering changes required in the existing machinery for the international control of narcotic drugs. Fifteen governments, elected by the Council, comprise the membership of the Commission. Its last (sixth) session was held at Lake Success, April 15-May 14, 1951.

Among the items on the provisional agenda of the forthcoming session are the proposed single convention on narcotic drugs; progress report on the work of the Division of Narcotic Drugs; abolition of opium smoking in the Far East; annual reports of governments; laws and regulations relating to the control of narcotic drugs; the report of the U.N. Commission of Enquiry on the Coca Leaf; and illicit traffic in narcotic drugs in 1951, including illicit trafficking by the crews of merchant ships.

Communiqués Regarding Korea to the Security Council

The Headquarters of the United Nations Command has transmitted communiqués regarding Korea to the Secretary-General of the United Nations under the following numbers issued in 1952: S/2535, February 20; S/2549, March 5; S/2551, March 6; S/2552, March 7; S/2553, March 10; S/2554, March 10; S/2556, March 11; S/2557, March 12; S/2558, March 13; S/2559, March 17; S/2560, March 17; S/2562, March 18; S/2563, March 20; S/2565, March 24.

The United States in the United Nations

A weekly feature, does not appear in this issue.

Progress Toward Solution of Europe's Refugee Problem

SECOND SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS FROM EUROPE

by George L. Warren

The second session of the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe was held at Geneva from February 18 through February 23, 1952. The first session took place immediately after the adjournment of the Conference on Migration at Brussels on December 5, 1951.¹ Fourteen governments at Brussels indicated intention to become members of the Committee. Seventeen governments were represented at Geneva as full participants in the Committee. Other governments, the Holy See, and international organizations were represented as observers.

At its first session the Migration Committee adopted a number of resolutions which brought it into formal existence, a budget totaling \$36,954,000, and a plan of operations to move during 1952, 116,000 migrants and refugees who would not otherwise be moved from Europe to overseas countries of immigration. Upon the termination of operations of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) on January 31, 1952, the Migration Committee took over the direction and operation of ten ships, already reconditioned for the movement of migrants, which were relinquished by IRO. The Committee also undertook on that date the movement of 12,205 refugees who had received visas to countries of immigration prior to that date but whom IRO was unable to move because of exhaustion of its funds. IRO made a payment to the Migration Committee of \$950,000 toward the estimated cost of this movement (\$2,300,000) and undertook to pay the balance of approximately \$1,300,000 from any further funds that might be received by the Organization during its period of liquidation. In February 1952, the first month of operations, the Committee moved

over 9,000 migrants and refugees from Europe and scheduled the movement of over 11,000 persons for March.

At the second session at Geneva, the following 17 Governments were represented as full members of the Committee: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United States, and Venezuela. Austria and Venezuela were not represented at the first session of the Committee and Denmark was represented only as an observer. The following additional Governments were represented at Geneva as observers: Argentina, Colombia, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The representatives of New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden indicated informally that decisions as to membership in the Migration Committee by their Governments would be made as soon as consideration had been given to the allocations of contributions made to them by the Committee during the course of the second session. The representatives of Israel, Peru, and the United Kingdom reported that membership in the Committee was under active consideration by their Governments.

The Deputy Director, Pierre Jacobsen, reported that during February 1952 negotiations had been initiated with emigration countries to organize the necessary facilities and processing for the outward movement of migrants and refugees. Similar negotiations were also in progress with immigration countries in order to complete the final schedule of movements planned for 1952. The U.S. Displaced Persons Commission had made arrangements with the Committee to move approximately 28,000 German migrants, eligible for admission to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act, on a full cost reimbursable basis, and initial payment on account of this movement of \$765,000 had already been made to the Committee. Other movements during Feb-

¹ For an article by Mr. Warren on the Conference on Migration and the first session of the Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, see BULLETIN of Feb. 4, 1952, p. 169.

ruary and March 1952 comprised 1,000 persons to Rio de Janeiro, 3,050 to Australia, and 1,150 to Canada. Two of the ships under charter to the Migration Committee were being used solely in the movement of migrants from the Netherlands to Australia and Canada. The Deputy Director also reported that a trust fund of \$500,000 had been deposited with the Committee by the IRO to cover the cost of transport of any refugees remaining in Shanghai who might secure visas to countries of immigration in the future. Over 150 such refugees had already left Shanghai at the expense of the fund.

Revised Budget Adopted

As a result of the foregoing developments the Committee adopted a revised budget totaling \$41,350,660, an increase of \$4,396,660 over the total of \$36,954,000 adopted at the first session at Brussels. This increase was entirely in the operational items of the budget—no changes being made in the totals of the administrative expenditures or of the operating fund. The total number of persons to be moved by the Committee by the end of December 1952 was increased from 116,000 estimated at Brussels to 137,500. This increase in the persons to be moved was accounted for largely by the refugees turned over to the Migration Committee by IRO for movement and also by the prospect of the movement during the year of an additional 10,000 refugees. The larger movement envisaged automatically increased the total of reimbursements anticipated from governments and of dollar equivalents of services rendered by governments directly, which was set down at \$22,254,504. Of this total, services paid for directly by governments such as the processing of migrants were estimated at \$8,800,000 and reimbursements for transportation at \$13,374,504. Included in this latter figure was the \$2,100,000 anticipated to be received from the Government of Italy for the movement of 35,000 migrants from Italy at \$60 per migrant. In addition to the \$13,374,504 in reimbursements for transportation, \$2,737,096 was expected to be received in reimbursements from IRO for the movement of refugees from Europe and Shanghai.

Each member government of the Migration Committee is obligated to make an agreed contribution to the administrative expenditures of the Committee. During the session new percentage allocations were made to the following member and prospective member governments as follows:

	Percent
Denmark	1.144
Norway	1.080
Sweden	2.600
Israel297
Argentina	4.400
Venezuela	1.000
New Zealand	2.119
Total	12.620

The representative of Venezuela formally accepted the allocation to his Government at the session. As a result of the discussion on the new allocations of contributions, the Committee agreed that the whole scale of allocations of contributions would be reviewed later when a decision was reached to continue the activities of the Migration Committee for a second year.

The representatives of the governments present at the second session were not in a position to announce formally the amounts of their anticipated contributions to the operating fund. Contributions to the operating fund of \$14,000,000 are voluntary. The purpose of the operating fund is, first, to supply working capital for the Committee's operations, and thereafter, to cover the cost of movement of those migrants and refugees who are not included in the cost reimbursable schemes of movement and for whose movement no other funds are available. Approximately \$9,000,000 of the U.S. contribution will constitute a contribution to the operating fund. Many of the governments represented at the session indicated that the appropriate procedures had already been initiated to provide their contributions to the operating fund.

Appointments to Committee's Staff

The Deputy Director reported that he was in the process of establishing the staff of the Committee and of necessity had been obliged to make a limited number of appointments from the former IRO staff, particularly of those persons directly engaged in shipping operations. Such appointments were essential in order to maintain momentum of movement and to avoid demurrage charges on ships taken over from IRO. Many appointments made to date are of a purely provisional nature and subject to change after the full membership of the Committee is known in order that the final composition of the staff may reflect the appropriate balance of nationalities. As of February 1, 1952, 49 officials of professional grades and 125 employees had been recruited. Of the officials, 27 were at headquarters and 22 in field liaison offices. Small liaison missions have been established in Australia, Austria, Brazil, Germany, Greece, Italy, and the United States. The total number of officials eventually to be recruited is 107 and recruitment is proceeding with respect to the 58 posts still to be filled.

The Committee discontinued the arrangement adopted at Brussels by which the powers and authority of the Director were vested in Franz Leemans and George L. Warren. In lieu of this arrangement, the Committee established an Executive Committee consisting of representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, and the United States. The chairman of the session, Mr. Leemans, advanced the suggestion that the Executive Committee meet at Washington in

May 1952. This suggestion appeared to meet with general approval. The powers and authority of the Director were vested temporarily in Mr. Jacobsen as Deputy Director until such time as a Director is elected by the Committee.

A close review of the passengers available for movement and of their destinations revealed that when the current movement to the United States is completed in early June 1952, there may be an inadequate number of passengers to fill all the ships under charter to the Committee until mid-July when the peak of the anticipated seasonal movements to Canada and Australia will be reached. By mid-summer of 1952 the Committee may require more ships than are presently available to meet the total requirements of movement. The Deputy Director, in consequence, urged the governments receiving migrants to plan their movement schedules in close cooperation with the Committee staff in order that an evenly balanced movement may be secured throughout the year and ships available to the Committee be used at maximum efficiency without financial loss resulting from demurrage charges.

Mr. Leemans (Belgium) was elected and served as chairman of the second session of the Committee. Giusti del Giardino (Italy) served as first vice chairman; F. Nilo de Alvaranga (Brazil) as second vice chairman; and Dr. H. von Trutzschler (Germany) as rapporteur. The Committee adjourned on February 23, 1952, to be reconvened at the call of the Chairman but in no event later than September 1952.

• Mr. Warren, author of the above article, is Adviser on Refugees and Displaced Persons, Department of State. He was U. S. representative to the February session of the Migration Committee.

Current United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Security Council

Decisions Taken and Resolutions Adopted by the Security Council During the Year 1951. Prepared by the Department of Security Council Affairs. S/INF/6, March 4, 1952. 17 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an Official Records series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

Economic and Social Council

- Local Human Rights Committees or Information Groups. E/CN.4/519/Add.1, March 10, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.
The Problem of Statelessness. Information Transmitted by States in Pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 352 (XII) relating to the problem of statelessness. E/2164/Add.19, February 13, 1952. 11 pp. mimeo.
Critical Shortage of Insecticides For Public Health Purposes. Report of the Working Party on Insecticides DDT and BHC under Council resolution 377 (XIII). E/2183, E/AC.38/1, March 10, 1952. 18 pp. mimeo.
UNICEF Assistance For Long-Range Child Feeding Programmes in Central America. E/ICEF/186, March 13, 1952. 49 pp. mimeo.
Statement Concerning His Consultations on Preparations for an *Ad Hoc* Meeting on Trade, by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe. E/ECE/146, March 12, 1952. 7 pp. mimeo.
Progress Report on UNICEF-Assisted Milk Conservation Programmes. E/ICEF/189, March 21, 1952. 27 pp. mimeo.
The Problem of Statelessness. Information transmitted by States in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution 352 (XII) relating to the problem of statelessness. E/2164/Add.4, March 14, 1952. 6 pp. mimeo.
Implementation of Recommendations on Economic and Social Matters. Economic and Social Council resolution 283 (X). Texts of Replies From Governments of Member States. E/2165/Add.15/Corr.1, March 17, 1952. 11 pp. mimeo.

Trusteeship Council

- Land Alienation and Land and Population Distribution in the Territory of the Cameroons Under French Administration. Memorandum submitted by the Government of France. T/AC.36/L.40, March 5, 1952. 32 pp. mimeo.
Land Utilization in the Trust Territory of the Cameroons Under French Administration. Memorandum submitted by the French Government. T/AC.36/L.39, March 5, 1952. 14 pp. mimeo.
Committee on the Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories. Population, Land Categories and Tenure in Somaliland Under Italian Administration. (Working paper prepared by the Secretariat.) T/AC.36/L.42, March 6, 1952. 9 pp. mimeo.
Land Utilization in the Trust Territory of Togoland Under French Administration. Memorandum submitted by the Government of France. T/AC.36/L.38, March 10, 1952. 6 pp. mimeo.
Conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru. Working paper prepared by the Secretariat. T/L.244, March 11, 1952. 25 pp. mimeo.
Revision of the Provisional Questionnaire. Report of the Drafting Committee on the Questionnaire. T/L.246, March 17, 1952. 99 pp. mimeo.
First Report of the Standing Committee on Petitions. T/L.247, March 24, 1952. 7 pp. mimeo.
Outline of Conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. Working paper prepared by the Secretariat. T/L.231/Corr.1, March 24, 1952. 7 pp. mimeo.
Examination of Petitions. Cameroons and Togoland under French Administration. Observations of the Administering Authority. T/973, March 24, 1952. 9 pp. mimeo.
Conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. Report of the Drafting Committee. T/L.248, March 24, 1952. 5 pp. mimeo.
Organization and Functioning of Visiting Missions. T/L.249, March 26, 1952. 10 pp. mimeo.
Examination of Petitions. Second Report of the Standing Committee on Petitions. T/L.255, March 28, 1952. 29 pp. mimeo.

Request for Extension of Emergency Powers

[Released to the press by the White House April 7]

The President on April 7 sent identical letters to Alben W. Barkley, President of the Senate of the United States, and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, as follows:

I ask the Congress as a matter of the utmost urgency to act, before it commences its Easter recess, to extend for a period of sixty days emergency powers which otherwise will terminate when the treaty of peace with Japan becomes effective.

On February 19, acting on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I transmitted to the Congress a proposed Emergency Powers Continuation Act¹ and recommended favorable action thereon.

This measure would continue specific enumerated powers until six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until earlier dates fixed by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President.

There was a single, simple reason for this measure, namely, the impending termination of the state of war with Japan through the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Japan. As I explained in my message, the still-existing state of war with Japan—which is the last existing state of war between this country and others—provides the legal foundation for many important statutory powers which this Government is now exercising in carrying out the national defense program. I pointed out that unless the Congress acts to continue these powers they will end when the state of war with Japan ends (or, in some cases, within a fixed time thereafter), with very serious consequences for the national security.

The Congress has been considering my request, but has not yet passed the required legislation. In the meantime, the Senate has given its advice and consent to the ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and the required number of other countries have ratified the Treaty so that it is anticipi-

pated that it can be brought into effect as soon as the ratification by the United States is deposited.

There are important reasons why the Japanese Peace Treaty must be put into force very promptly. Failure to do so will be a reflection on responsible government in the United States, which will be very damaging and impossible to explain to the rest of the world. However, in the absence of action by the Congress the coming into force of the Treaty would result in the termination of certain emergency powers which are now being exercised and which are very important.

I therefore urge the Congress to act immediately to provide at least a temporary extension of the emergency powers in order to prevent a lapse when the Japanese Peace Treaty is put into effect.

I would like to set forth some of the compelling reasons why bringing the Japanese Peace Treaty into force cannot be delayed.

Advance planning has been going on many months for the necessary steps involved in turning authority back to the Japanese Government when the Treaty comes into force. This planning has been done not only by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, and the Government of Japan, but also on the part of other powers concerned. These plans have been made on the basis that the present Treaty will come into force by the first half of April. Any significant delay beyond that time would seriously interfere with Japan's orderly transition from the status of an occupied country to that of a free and independent country. Furthermore, because of the complexity of the plans and the number of governments involved, the date finally established for bringing the Treaty into force must be announced ten days in advance. This is why action by the Congress before Easter is imperative.

The United States cannot be put in the position of delaying the bringing into force of the Treaty. The Treaty was signed in the United States—at San Francisco—on September 8, 1951. Long before that the United States had urged that peace be re-established with Japan as promptly as possible, and the United States took the lead in negotiating the Treaty. Because of the special position

¹ H. Doc. 386.

of the United States as the principal occupying power in Japan, the Treaty provides that, regardless of other ratifications, it shall not come into force without the deposit of the ratification of the United States. This deposit has not been made. If now the United States were to delay the Treaty's coming into force, for avoidable reasons of a domestic nature, when other countries are ready to act, no credit would be brought either to this country or to our democratic processes. We would be widely misunderstood even among our friends, and we would open the way for hostile propaganda by those in Japan who would turn their backs on the democratic way of life.

It is likewise of the utmost importance to the security of the country to continue in effect without any lapse the emergency powers dealt with in the proposed measure I have recommended. Among these are the authorizations under which the Government is now operating the railroads to insure the movement of troops and war materials; is controlling the entry into and the departure from the United States of aliens and citizens whose movements would be dangerous to the national security; is continuing the commissions of a large number of reserve officers on active duty in our armed forces the loss of whom would create a serious problem; and is making full use of trained aviation officers who would be lost by the reinstatement of peacetime limitations. Furthermore, there are a number of provisions which furnish protection and benefits to civilians engaged in defense activities, to members of the armed forces, to veterans, and to the members of their families.

As is apparent, these powers are such that even a brief lapse would have the most serious consequences.

Consequently, the problem which confronts us can be solved only by very prompt Congressional action; and I earnestly ask that such action be taken.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN

EDITOR'S NOTE: On April 9 Congress passed a bill on extension of presidential war powers. However, in the final version of the bill, as amended by the Senate and concurred in by the House, the extension date of some 60 war powers was finally established as June 1, in spite of President Truman's request for a 60-day extension.

Coordination Procedures Under The Mutual Security Act

Executive Order 10338¹

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 507 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, 65 Stat. 373 (Public Law 165, 82nd Congress, approved October 10, 1951), and as President of the United States and Commander in

Chief of the armed forces of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Functions of the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission. (a) The Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission in each country, as the representative of the President and acting on his behalf, shall coordinate the activities of the United States representatives (including the chiefs of economic missions, military assistance advisory groups, and other representatives of agencies of the United States Government) in such country engaged in carrying out programs under the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and he shall assume responsibility for assuring the unified development and execution of the said programs in such country. More particularly, the functions of each Chief of United States Diplomatic Mission shall include, with respect to the programs and country concerned:

(1) Exercising general direction and leadership of the entire effort.

(2) Assuring that recommendations and prospective plans and actions of the United States representatives are effectively coordinated and are consistent with and in furtherance of the established policy of the United States.

(3) Assuring that the interpretation and application of instructions received by the United States representatives from higher authority are in accord with the established policy of the United States.

(4) Guiding the United States representatives in working out measures to prevent duplication in their efforts and to promote the most effective and efficient use of all United States officers and employees having mutual security responsibilities.

(5) Keeping the United States representatives fully informed as to current and prospective United States policies.

(6) Prescribing procedures governing the coordination of the activities of the United States representatives, and assuring that these representatives shall have access to all available information essential to the accomplishment of their prescribed duties.

(7) Preparing and submitting such reports on the operation and status of the programs under the Act as may be directed by the Director for Mutual Security.

(b) Each Chief of United States Diplomatic Mission shall perform his functions under this order in accordance with instructions from higher authority and subject to established policies and programs of the United States.

(c) No Chief of United States Diplomatic Mission shall delegate any function conferred upon him by the provisions of this order which directly involves the exercise of direction, coordination, or authority.

SEC. 2. Referral of unresolved matters. The Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission in each country shall initiate steps to reconcile any divergent views arising in the country concerned with respect to programs under the Act. If agreement cannot be reached the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission shall recommend a course of action, and such course of action shall be followed unless a United States representative requests that the issue be referred to higher authority for decision. If such a request is made, the parties concerned shall promptly refer the issue to higher authority for resolution prior to taking action at the country level. The Director for Mutual Security shall assure expeditious decisions on matters so submitted.

SEC. 3. Effect of order on United States representatives. (a) All United States representatives in each country shall be subject to the responsibilities imposed upon the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission in such country by section 507 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and by this order.

(b) Subject to compliance with the provisions of this order and with the prescribed procedures of their respective agencies, all United States representatives affected by this order (1) shall have direct communication with their respective agencies and with such other parties and in such manner as may be authorized by their respec-

¹ 17 Fed. Reg. 3009.

tive agencies, (2) shall keep the respective Chiefs of United States Diplomatic Missions and each other fully and currently informed on all matters, including prospective plans, recommendations, and actions, relating to programs under the Act, and (3) shall furnish to the respective Chiefs of United States Diplomatic Missions upon their request, documents and information concerning the said programs.

SEC. 4. Further coordination procedures. The Director for Mutual Security shall be responsible for assuring the carrying out of the provisions of this order. He is authorized to prescribe, after consultation with the interested Government agencies, any additional procedures he may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

SEC. 5. Prior orders. (a) To the extent that provisions of any prior order are inconsistent with the provisions of this order, the latter shall control, and any such prior provisions are amended accordingly. All orders, regulations, rulings, certificates, directives, and other actions relating to any function affected by this order shall remain in effect except as they are inconsistent herewith or are hereafter amended or revoked under proper authority.

(b) Nothing in this order shall affect Executive Orders Nos. 10062, 10063, and 10144 of June 6, 1949, June 13, 1949, and July 21, 1950, respectively.

(c) Executive Orders Nos. 9857, 9862, 9864, 9914, 9944, 9960, 10208, and 10259 of May 22, 1947, May 31, 1947, May 31, 1947, December 26, 1947, April 9, 1948, May 19, 1948, January 25, 1951, and June 27, 1951, respectively, are hereby revoked.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 4, 1952

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

New Ambassador to U.S.S.R. Takes Oath of Office

Statement by Ambassador George F. Kennan

[Released to the press April 2]

There is very little that I can say at this time. As you know, the President has appointed me Ambassador to the Soviet Union. I am down here in Washington to take the oath of office and get ready for my new job. I am going to start for Moscow in the latter part of this month.

My job in Moscow, as I see it, will be to implement the policies of the U.S. Government within the area of responsibility given to me. The Embassy at Moscow is only one small part of the machinery for the implementation of our foreign policy and its effectiveness is always going to depend on the extent to which the Ambassador there bears this in mind and contrives to function as a member of a team. The opportunities for service must be determined, as in the case of any other diplomatic mission, largely by circumstances, and I cannot foresee them at this time. I will be happy if the work at Moscow gives me a chance to

make a contribution to the reduction of existing tensions and the improvement of the international atmosphere. Those are objectives which seem to me urgently desirable and I see no reason why they should not be within the realm of possibility, if the desire is reciprocated.

Samuel Reber, Jr., Named U.S. Assistant High Commissioner for Germany

[Released to the press April 8]

U.S. High Commissioner John J. McCloy announced on April 8 the appointment of Samuel Reber as U.S. Assistant High Commissioner, a post he will fill in addition to duties as Director of the Office of Political Affairs. At the same time Mr. McCloy announced that Chauncey G. Parker, Assistant High Commissioner, will return to the United States this week. Maj. Gen. George P. Hays, Deputy High Commissioner, who was recently appointed Commanding General of U.S. Forces in Austria, expects to leave Germany next week for his new post in Salzburg.

After General Hays' departure and during the absence of Mr. McCloy, Mr. Reber will be the ranking Hicog official. The High Commissioner is planning to fly to Washington next week to attend the annual hearings before congressional committees. Mr. Parker, who will assist him at the hearings, will then reassume his position with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development from which he has been on loan to Hicog since late 1950.

The appointment of Mr. Reber, Mr. McCloy pointed out, is in line with organizational changes being made throughout Hicog in anticipation of the conclusion of contractual agreements with Germany and the change-over to Embassy status. Mr. Reber, a career diplomat, has been Director of the Office of Political Affairs since June 1950 and one of Mr. McCloy's principal advisers.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: Apr. 5-11, 1952

Releases may be obtained from the Office of the Special Assistant for Press Relations, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. Items marked (*) are not printed in the BULLETIN; items marked (†) will appear in a future issue.

No.	Date	Subject
235	3/26	S. Africa educational exchange
244	3/31	Military assistance to Uruguay
248	4/1	Fisher: Foreign policy
249	4/1	Kennan: Oath of office
258	4/4	Patterson: Progress toward security
259	4/4	Murphy: Belgium's contribution
*262	4/7	Queen Juliana: Program of visit
†263	4/7	Iran: Student assistance
*264	4/8	U. S. representatives to NAC.
265	4/8	Draper: Permanent NAC representative
266	4/8	Reber: New post in Germany
267	4/9	Chile: Military assistance
268	4/9	Cannes film festival
269	4/9	Hydrographic conference
270	4/9	Seventh session of ITU
271	4/9	El Salvador: Point Four agreement
272	4/9	Acheson: Point Four Program
273	4/11	Venezuela: Trade negotiations
274	4/11	Narcotic drugs commission
275	4/11	Inter-Am. travel congress

Africa	
Underdeveloped areas, problems in, address (Sayre)	623
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA: Educational exchange agreement with	630
American Principles	
Good Faith vs. Empty Promises in the War of Ideas (Fisher)	618
Point Four—A Revolution Against Hunger, Disease and Human Misery (Truman, Acheson)	607
U.S.-Netherlands relations reviewed (Truman)	613
American Republics	
CHILE: Military-assistance agreement signed with U.S.	630
COLOMBIA: Export-Import Bank extends power credit	631
EL SALVADOR: Point Four agreement with, signed	631
Inter-American Travel Congress	637
URUGUAY: Conversations on military-assistance agreement	630
VENEZUELA: Negotiations for supplementary trade agreement with	631
Asia	
KOREA: Communiqués to Security Council	637
Underdeveloped areas, problems in, address (Sayre)	623
Communism	
Good Faith vs. Empty Promises in the War of Ideas (Fisher)	618
Congress	
Legislation listed	612
Presidential request for extension of emergency powers	641
Europe	
Belgium's and Switzerland's progress toward security (Murphy, Patterson)	616
GERMANY: Reber appointed assistant high commissioner	643
NETHERLANDS: Relations with U.S. reviewed (Truman)	613
SHAPE: Eisenhower, release from assignment as Supreme Commander, requested, correspondence (Ely, Lovett)	614
Finance	
Export-Import Bank extends power credit to Colombia	631
Foreign Service	
Kennan takes oath of office as ambassador to U.S.S.R.	643
Information and Educational Exchange Program	
Educational exchange agreement with South Africa	630
International Meetings	
Cannes Film Festival to be held	636
Commission on Narcotic Drugs, 7th session	637
Fourth Inter-American Travel Congress	637
General Assembly, report on 6th session (Taylor)	632
Hydrographic Conference, Sixth International	636
ITU, 7th session of Administrative Council	636
Mutual Aid and Defense	
Conversations on military-assistance agreement with Uruguay	630
Mutual Security	
Belgium's and Switzerland's progress toward security (Murphy, Patterson)	616
Mutual Security Act: Coordination procedures, Executive Order 10338, text	642
North Atlantic Council	
Draper to be permanent U.S. representative	615
Presidential Documents	
Emergency powers requested, letter to Barkley and Rayburn	641
Executive Order 10338, coordination procedures, text	642
Publications	
Recent releases	622
Refugees and Displaced Persons	
Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe, report of 2d session (Warren)	638
Technical Cooperation and Development	
POINT FOUR:	
A Revolution Against Hunger, Disease, and Human Misery (Truman, Acheson)	607
Agreement with El Salvador, signed	631
Telecommunications	
Administrative Council (ITU), 7th session, U.S. delegation to	636
Treaty Information	
CHILE: Military-assistance agreement signed	630
EL SALVADOR: Point Four agreement signed	631
SOUTH AFRICA: Educational exchange agreement signed	630
URUGUAY: Military-assistance agreement, conversations	630
VENEZUELA: Supplementary trade agreement negotiations	631
United Nations	
ECOSOC: Commission on Narcotic Drugs, U.S. representative (Anslinger)	637
GENERAL ASSEMBLY: report on sixth session (Taylor)	632
IRO: Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe, report of 2d session (Warren)	638
SECURITY COUNCIL: Communiqués regarding Korea	637
TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL: Problems in underdeveloped areas, address (Sayre)	623
U.N. bibliography: selected documents	640
<i>Name Index</i>	
Acheson, Secretary Dean	607
Anslinger, Harry J.	636
Daniels, Paul C.	637
de Wolfe, Francis Colt	637
Draper, William H., Jr.	615
Eisenhower, Gen. Dwight D.	614
Fisher, Adrian S.	618
Heaton, Earl O.	636
Kennan, George F.	643
Merchant, Livingston T.	615
Lindstrom, Chester A.	636
Lovett, Robert A.	614
Mayer, Gerald M.	636
McCloy, John J.	643
Merchant, Livingston T.	615
Murphy, Robert D.	616
Patterson, Richard C.	616
Reber, Samuel, Jr.	643
Rubottom, Roy R., Jr.	631
Sayre, Francis B.	623
Taylor, Paul B.	632
Truman, President Harry S.	607, 613, 641
Warren, George L.	638